DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 855 24 HE 000 864

The Quest for Relevance: Effective College Teaching. Volume I. The Humanities.
American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2999
Pub Date Mar 69
Contract-OEC-4-7-062999-3492
Note-77p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
Descriptors-*Effective Teaching, *Higher Education, *Humanities, *Humanities Instruction, Literature, Teachers, *Teaching Methods, Verbal Communication

Responding to a widely expressed discontent about college teaching shared by students, faculty and administrators, representatives of national professional and higher educational associations formed a committee to study means of revitalizing and reorienting instruction. Each contributor in Volume I, selected for his outstanding teaching skills in the humanities, examines current trends in teaching in his area or discipline, offers a critical review of the principal methods used, and provides pertinent bibliographical references. In his Introduction, Russell M. Cooper notes the impossibility of prescribing any single method of improving teaching and calls for reflection and self-criticism by the teacher. "Teaching Styles in the Humanities" by Joseph Axelrod cautions that relevance does not mean modernity but can be achieved by new ways of organizing the subject matter. Wallace W. Douglas, in "Some Questions about the Teaching of Works of Literary Art", aruges that teachers should re-examine their objectives. In "Teaching the Humanities", O.B. Hardison says that teaching is a cooperative affair varying with the class and that the teacher needs to be creative and conscious of the values he is transmitting. James M. McCrimmon's "Verbal Communication" calls attention to the difficulties of building awareness in students of composition as a process. The focus on college teaching here is from the standpoint of the disciplines whereas most of the literature treats it as a general topic. (JS)

BR6-2999
PA 24 Vol I

OE-BR

Contract No. OEC 4-7-062999-3492

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE QUEST FOR RELEVANCE

Effective College Teaching

VOLUME I

THE HUMANITIES

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION March 1969

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE000 864

Contract No. OEC 4-7-062999-3492

THE QUEST FOR RELEVANCE

Effective College Teaching

FOUR VOLUMES

VOLUME I

THE HUMANITIES

Prepared by the

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Washington, D. C.

March 1969

G. Kerry Smith
Executive Secretary

William H. Morris
Associate Executive Secretary
and Project Liaison Officer

Robert G. Bone
President Emeritus
Illinois State University
and Project Director

Ada Jane Kelly
Project Editor

This research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PREFACE

This volume grows out of a deepening concern of leaders among national professional societies and members of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) for improving quality and increasing relevance in college teaching. Responding to a widely expressed discontent among students and unease within the teaching profession, the AAHE assumed responsibility for calling together representatives from professional organizations to discuss the means of revitalizing and reorienting instruction in colleges and universities.

These representatives, under the chairmanship of Russell M. Cooper, Dean of Liberal Arts, University of South Florida, formed the Joint Committee on College Teaching (JCOT). The committee has included representatives from the following professional associations:

American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association for Higher Education
American Association of Junior Colleges
American Chemical Society
American Council on Education
American Council of Learned Societies
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Institute of Biological Sciences
American Institute of Physics
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
College English Association
Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences
Modern Language Association of America
U. S. Office of Education

The Advisory Committee for the study, listed below, was drawn largely from representatives of that group of organizations.

The completion of the book envisioned by the Joint Committee on Teaching has been made possible by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education with the AAHE serving as administrative and fiscal agent.

The contributors to this book were selected because of their vivid conceptions and demonstrable skills in teaching. Collectively, they do not offer a comprehensive representation of all disciplines. In fact, as originally divergent views on the rationale and scope of the book coalesced into a consensus, a clearly interdisciplinary overtone developed despite a format suggesting otherwise.

This work is divided into four volumes, but all volumes use the same preface, introduction, and general bibliography. The first three examine college teaching as perceived by some outstanding teachers representing the humanities (Volume I), the sciences (Volume II), and the social sciences (Volume III). In each volume an outstanding teacher discusses an entire area of study. Additional teachers of note, with full freedom to take an interdisciplinary stance, discuss the area with particular reference to their own disciplines. Each contributor to the first three volumes was asked to examine current trends in teaching in his area or discipline, to offer a critical review of the principal methods in use, and to provide pertinent bibliographical references.

The fourth volume treats, first, of matters of instruction which may be regarded as characteristic of effective teaching in all disciplines, with special attention to modern teaching aids (increasingly regarded not as incidental adjuncts but as essential to optimal learning), and the evaluative aspects of the teaching-learning process. This volume treats, second, of matters pertaining to the place of the teacher in his university and his community and of his responsibilities to them. It discusses the manner in which universities are organized administratively and in general terms discusses the regulations, communications and practices which are found on campus.

This book is intended for independent reading and as a basis for seminar and workshop discussion. Selected bibliographies are provided to encourage further exploration of knowledge of the art and craft of teaching. The book is designed not merely to communicate the personal experience of the authors but also to reflect the range of research and literature on college teaching.

Improving college teaching is certainly not a neglected subject. A long list of publications could be given, and many are included in the bibliography. The AHE (now AAHE) itself published "New Perspectives on Teaching the Disciplines," in Current Issues of Higher Education, 1962. It contains papers presented at AAHE's 17th National Conference on the teaching of the social sciences, geography, English, fine arts, and other subjects. Other publications that might be mentioned include these:

Wilbert McKeachie's Teaching Tips is a guidebook for the beginning college teacher (George Wahr Publishing Co. 1965).

Improving College and University Teaching, the quarterly edited by Delmer M. Goode for many years has delivered a broad range of short articles.

Improving College Teaching, edited by Calvin B. T. Lee and written by teachers and administrators, covers a wide variety of subjects and innovations.

The Importance of Teaching: A Memorandum to the New Teacher, is a guide to self-examination for those entering the profession.

Teaching in a Junior College, by Roger H. Garrison, deals with problems peculiar to junior and other kinds of 2-year colleges.

The Graduate Student as Teacher, prepared by Vincent Nowles, Kenneth Clark, and Miriam Rock reports a project at the University of Rochester.

Little in the literature on college teaching is prepared from the standpoint of the disciplines. Much that has been produced is general. It is to this deficiency that the present work is directed. At a period when it may seem perilous to write anything concerning higher education in the United States, the contributions in this work have been assembled with the conviction that all dedicated teachers are seeking ways of improving their teaching and of providing relevant subject matter as they challenge their students. It is the hope of those responsible for the work that it will be helpful to all college teachers and especially to those entering the profession.

Robert G. Bone
Project Director

Advisory Committee

Russell M. Cooper, University of South Florida, chairman
Bruce Dearing, State University of New York (SUNY) at Binghampton
Maxwell H. Goldberg, Pennsylvania State University
Harold L. Hodgkinson, University of California, Berkeley
Arthur H. Livermore, American Association for the Advancement of Science
Paul L. Ward, American Historical Association
Winslow R. Hatch, Division of Higher Education Research, U. S. Office of Education.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I: THE HUMANITIES

Introduction: The College Teacher Today 1
Russell M. Cooper

Teaching Styles in the Humanities 3
Joseph Axelrod

Some Questions About the Teaching of Works of Literary Art
Wallace W. Douglas 23

Teaching the Humanities
O. B. Hardison Jr. 35

Verbal Communication
James M. McCrimmon 46

VOLUME II: THE SCIENCES

Introduction: The College Teacher Today
Russell M. Cooper

The Art of Teaching Science
Morris H. Shamos

A Path to Relevant Teaching
Garrett Hardin

The Earth Sciences
Sheldon Judson

The Teaching of College Chemistry
W. T. Lippincott

The Beginning Teacher of College Mathematics
R. L. Wilder

VOLUME III: THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Introduction: The College Teacher Today 1
Russell M. Cooper

The Task of the Teacher in the Social Sciences 3
Kenneth E. Boulding

Teaching Political Science 25
Leonard J. Fein

Teaching the Past in the Present 31
Henry Cord Meyer

The Teaching of Psychology 43
Robert B. MacLeod

VOLUME IV: PRACTICAL CONCERNS FOR ALL COLLEGE TEACHERS

Introduction: The College Teacher Today 1
Russell M. Cooper

Earning and Learning by the Hour 3
Stanford C. Ericksen

Finding the Levers: The Organization of the Profession 46
Lewis B. Mayhew

Finding the Levers: The Folkways and Mores of Campus Governance 63
Harold L. Hodgkinson

Note: The forematter, the introduction, and the bibliography are identical in each volume.

INTRODUCTION: THE COLLEGE TEACHER TODAY

by Russell Cooper*

> "I will do such things, -
> What they are, yet I know not; but they shall be
> The terrors of the earth! -- King Lear

At a time when inarticulate fury and a deep sense of betrayal are being translated into irrational violence on American campuses, it behooves the teaching profession to consider seriously the inadequacies and lapses of which it stands accused. Under the best of circumstances, teachers should be eager and active in searching out ways to improve their performance. Now, more than ever before, the public at large and the young in particular pose penetrating questions for institutions of higher learning. Teachers are called upon to defend the relevance of the subject matter they offer, to adopt new styles and techniques in teaching an ever-increasing number of students with varying backgrounds and disparate expectations, and to consider the influence, actual and potential, of higher education upon the social problems of the day.

In the quieter past, the home, the church, and to a degree industry have been dominant influences on the culture and mores of the nation. Now, institutions of higher learning find themselves closer to the center of the stage than ever before. An inescapable by-product of this new eminence and influence is responsibility for ensuring relevance in subject matter, challenge and intellectual excitement in providing and guiding learning experiences, and enlightening leadership in the development and improvement of society.

Ironically, at the very time when all components of society are demanding greater educational opportunity and college graduates with increased competence, willing and able to bring new order, justice, and human dignity to a world in chaos, much that the university has traditionally offered is scorned and rejected. At the very time the conscientious teacher is striving to present relevant concepts, information, and techniques effectively to rapidly multiplying numbers of impatient students, he must face vast amounts of new knowledge which should be sorted, assimilated, reorganized, and prepared for the classroom.

This volume has been written in the conviction that, while most teachers are well aware of the difficulties and satisfactions of effective teaching and share the assumption that there is no single exclusive method of excellent teaching, both the novice instructor and the senior professor can profit from a fresh and direct examination of the process of teaching and learning in higher education. Most academics concede that there is no such person as a "perfect" teacher and that any teacher who is genuinely content with his performance merely demonstrates that his goals were so modest it was possible for him to reach them. No responsible teacher lays claim to final truths which will guarantee perfection in the practice of teaching; nevertheless, many young teachers can learn much from those who have continued to learn and have been willing to test new ideas and to adapt those that proved successful. Veteran teachers can offer reliable suggestions concerning ventures likely to be productive and those likely to continue to lead to frustration and failure.

---

*Dr. Cooper is dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of South Florida, and Chairman, Joint Committee on College Teaching.

Students know--and act upon their knowledge--that some teachers are more effective than others, not merely or even necessarily more learned but more resourceful in engaging and exciting students and launching them on intellectual adventures of their own. Students also often recognize more astutely than faculty colleagues or academic administrators that many teachers are at their best with particular kinds of students but either fail to challenge with other types or to be appropriately compassionate. The lackluster lecturer may be a deft and probing seminar leader; the brilliant and dramatic expositor may be the overbearing monologist who frustrates small-group discussion. Whatever his gifts or limitations, the teacher with a vocation must be alertly self-critical; he must seek continually for increased effectiveness in communication and intellectual engagement; he must check repeatedly and with painful honesty to ensure that the knowledge he endeavors to communicate and the skills he seeks to develop are, and are demonstrated to be, relevant to the time and to the students.

This work has been designed primarily for those newly embarked upon a teaching career whether as neophyte faculty members at the end of graduate preparation or as teaching assistants in a university. But even the veteran teacher, like the admirable Clerk of Oxenford, with a mind open to fresh suggestion, should find much in these pages to inspire reflection and experimentation. Individual readers may be more interested in some sections than in others; however, a reading of the whole book should repay the effort, as it sets the task of teaching in full perspective.

This work reflects a deep and abiding common concern among leaders of national professional societies for the improvement of quality and the insurance of relevance in teaching in their several fields. If it succeeds in stimulating teachers to improve the practice of their art and craft and sustains them in their efforts, all those who have contributed to it will feel richly rewarded.

TEACHING STYLES IN THE HUMANITIES

by Joseph Axelrod *

"The social revolution in this country demands new educational procedures and perhaps new educational content," James R. Squire recently told an audience of English professors at a Modern Language Association meeting. Mr. Squire believes that the discipline-centered approach in the field of English has now run its course, and "some new educational crusade is about to replace it. (1)

The new educational crusade that is replacing the discipline-centered approach was in fact launch over a decade ago. Today's student activist movement, according to its closest observers,(2) began when SLATE was first organized at the University of California on the Berkeley campus and made its first set of "demands." Its platform was announced to the university's academic community in the Cal Reporter in March 1958:

> We will be concerned with students as citizens in society--with their involvement with national and international issues.
>
> We will be concerned with education--with whether or not the University helps us to be open-minded, thinking individuals.
>
> We will be concerned with academic function and civil liberties. We ask only a fair hearing in the open marketplace of ideas. (3)

During the next 6 years these small sounds of dissent were to grow into an insistent voice of protest; and in October 1964, participants in the annual meeting of the

---

*Dr. Axelrod, on leave from San Francisco State College, is project director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

American Council on Education, scheduled that year in San Francisco, read the Chronicle's headline over breakfast, Students Riot in Berkeley and were stunned.

By the close of that academic year many administrative officers and faculty members had begun to wonder whether student unrest on the American campus should not be taken as a sign of curricular and instructional failure. The Danforth Foundation's Annual Report for 1964-65 gave voice to those reflections: "Nearly every discussion of student unrest," the Report states, "points out the relation of that problem to the poor teaching that is often found on college and university campuses."

THE HUMANIST'S RESPONSE

For the professor in the humanities, more than for his colleagues in the social and natural sciences, the cry of "Relevance!" has been a particularly difficult demand to respond to. Many humanists have responded to it in creative ways. But more often the response has been either to retreat or to freeze.

The natural scientist can pretend that the cry is not directed to him. As the nation stands on the threshold of the "technetronic" age, everything he does somehow automatically appears to be relevant to the future of mankind. The social scientist responds fairly easily by reorganizing his materials for a "problems" approach.(4) But the humanist is caught between the neutralism that his scholarship requires and the direct involvement in man's problems that the characteristic ideology of American humanism demands.

The situation of the humanist is made more difficult because several of the basic tenets of the student revolution have been identical with his own traditional stance. In the first place both the revolutionary and the humanist are anti-bureaucracy, indeed, anti-organization in general. Both stress the worth and dignity of the human being as an individual. Both prize individual creative expression, and the humanist spends his life working on, and teaching, the greatest products of such expression. Second, both react against the application of logic and rationality to those areas of life that cannot, they believe, be governed by logic or rationality. The humanist has fought on almost every campus to preserve the legitimacy and academic acceptance of nonrationalistic modes of perception. For the same reason he has battled against creeping scientism in the humanities. The student revolutionary takes the same attitude: "Don't send us questionnaires " he says to the behavioral scientist who wants to study student activism; "just listen to our music!" (5)

Third, although the humanist has fought overspecialization and professionalization in the liberal arts, he has capitulated more often than he would like to admit; many English departments are more highly professionalized than many schools of business. Still, the humanist's ideological stance on this point is unambiguous. The revolutionary student, voicing the same ideology, condemns the university for the ease with which it serves big business and the big professions and big science, producing for them not men and leaders but robots and "achiever" types; that is, non-individuals whose college degree signifies their readiness to perform the exact tasks that industry demands.

Since the humanist has traditionally represented these principles, why should he retreat or freeze into paralysis at the cry of "Relevance!"? One reason might be that he misunderstands the message. There is no reason for him to teach King Lear as Endgame if he does not agree with Jan Kott on this point; nor need he include Mao Tse-tung's delicate poems in his Introduction to World Literature course, especially if he feels uncomfortable with old-style Chinese verse; and as for Bob Dylan, the humanist need not include him in the Major Figures course unless he wants to, even if a University of California sociologist does see him as "a prophet and explicator of the future." (6)

Many humanists misunderstand the cry of "Relevance!" Thinking it means merely modernity, the "here and now," they are justifiably suspicious. "It does not make sense," as the vice-chairman of the English department at Berkeley said recently, "to propose a survey course in English literature beginning with T. S. Eliot!" (7)

It its deepest senses, relevance does not mean modernity. Those who would reform curriculums according to the requirements of relevance argue their cause on quite different grounds. Their central opposition to standard curriculums in humanistic studies revolves around two major principles on which all such curriculums are built. The first of these asserts that a degree program in the discipline must "cover" the subject matter of the discipline systematically. According to this principle, the request made by many radical students--that they be allowed to study only those problems they find meaningful

--must be rejected. The principle of "self-determination" violates the principle of systematic coverage of subject matter.

A second principle on which standard curriculums are built asserts that a course cannot be offered in subject matter if no qualified expert is available on the faculty to conduct it. For example, a large West Coast English department has wished to offer a seminar in James Baldwin under its "Major Figures" course number, but it has not yet been able to find a qualified faculty member to give the seminar. The suggestion was rejected that the course be organized by a student or faculty member in the department. To accept this suggestion--that is, to allow a group of students and faculty or organize a course and use the university and community resources to "teach" it to themselves--was tantamount, the department felt, to throwing academic standards to the winds.

Many activist students and their faculty supporters have offered arguments against these two traditional principles that have raised no small number of hackles. They point out, first of all, that systematic coverage of a field is an illusion. At best, there is only "selective" coverage of subject matter in a field; such coverage is more or less identical from one campus to the next only so long as arbitrary agreements remain in force among most of the faculty members in the field. For example, there is common agreement that the literature studies in an English department shall include a fairly standard sampling of non-English works (studied in English Translation) while it excludes almost every original work written in English outside of British and American literatures. Before World War II there was fairly common agreement on coverage not only in literature, but also in language and linguistics. These agreements, however, have begun to break down; the once common subject matter of an English department isnow taking different shapes on different campuses. Department X, following the traditional emphasis on literature, is even today only lightly involved with linguistic science; department Y, has however more heavily moved into linguistics, and that new emphasis is reflected in the "coverage" required of its degree candidates. In department M, literary criticism and esthetics have come to be central; in N, they are still mere appendages to literary history.

A pointed example is the controversy over the inclusion of the study of the film as an art form. At one time there was general agreement that while dramas were appropriate for study "as literature," films were not. But today many faculty members look upon the film as the most expressive art form of the century and press for its inclusion among the subjects studied in literature departments.

There are good reasons, then, the argument concludes, why the principle of systematic coverage as the basis for building a curriculum has come to be seriously questioned. Indeed, new principles for organizing curriculums are being sought in many places. (8)Radical students and their faculty supporters suggest the "Fais ce que voudras" approach: Do what thou wilt. If a student happens to be interested in Joyce, he simply starts with Joyce, not planning where he will move next. But Joyce, he finds, inevitably leads to Homer; and so he must move to Homer, and in Homer he finds new meaning as well as a "key" to Joyce. If a student happens to be interested in Albee, he might wish to learn whether Mrs. Woolf's name is used merely for the pun or really connects with something about her life and work; to work at that problem, he must place her essays (especially the feminist ones) on his reading list, a novel or two, andperhaps Orlando. If Orlando, then he is inevitably led to the despised English literature survey, for he will surely want to discover what Orlando's sexual transformation in that odd biography symbolizes. And so it goes: a tutorial session with a culturally disadvantaged student may lead, with the help of a resourceful instructor, to a systematic analysis of a non-standard American dialect.

The traditional faculty member listens to such suggestions with some impatience and replies that the "Fais ce que voudras" approach is inappropriate for college students. It is appropriate, they argue, only for mature learners who have sufficient knowledge to guide themselves well and who have the inner discipline to persist in their intentions. The path might also have been right for some gentleman of leisure in the past century. (Indeed it apparently was for Virginia Woolf herself). But it is surely not institutionally feasible for the adolescent today. Moreover, his reply continues, how can a student be permitted to receive credit for pursuing an interest in, say, astrology, or in the parctice of magic? Yet, if the principle of self-determination is carried to its logical conclusion, a faculty member would not have the right to say of The Beard, "That is not worth spending time on," or of Charley's Aunt, "That is not even literature."

Then there is another objection the traditional faculty member poses. When a group of students wish to study subject matter their instructor knows nothing about, what is he to do? His training has prepared him to teach them a Shakespeare sonnet, but they decide they would rather read some African poems (in English translation). What then?

The radical students and faculty reply that of course no instructor should feel obliged to do something he does not wish to do or does not feel qualified to do. But surely, if he has had special training in poetry, and if he does not mind reading some African poetry, there is no doubt he can be helpful to his students. If is evident he could not probably "do" with it all that he was planning to do with the Shakespeare sonnet, for he is no expert in African studies; but one might hope that he is a more sophisticated student of poetry than the members of his class. The new approach based on theprinciple of relevance asks students and instructor to pursue the inquiry together, each making the contribution he can make. The basic requirement for every member of the group is sincerity; and the basic requirement for the faculty member specifically is that he should be a faster, more sophisticated learner than most of the students in the group.

Whatever the rhetoric in which this response of the radicals is clothed, it brings into focus an important point; namely, that "relevance" does not reside in one kind of specific subject matter rather than in another--a work of Mrs. Woolf's rather than one of Mme. de Stael's, a piece performed on the Moog rather than on the viola da gamba, in Swahili rather than Sanskrit, in Kurosawa rather than in Luke. Relevance resides in the relationships between the student and the instructor as they jointly pursue inquiries upon whatever subject matter they touch.

A clearer way of stating this point is that students are not asking today to "be taught"; they are asking to be given the freedom to "learn." The difference between these is indicated by the difference in verb form: "to be taught" is in the passive and "to learn" in the active form. That difference between passivity and activity in the educative process is crucial; it is like the difference between death and life.

FIVE TEACHING STYLES

As part of a project the author has been directing at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, he has attempted to explore the classroom styles of college teachers. He has been particularly interested in the implications of the principle of relevance for curricular-instructional reform.(9) Out of that study, there emerged a typology of teaching styles which posited the following five faculty prototypes:

TYPE A: The Drill master
TYPE B. The Content-Centered Faculty Member

TYPE C: The Instructor-Centered Faculty Member
TYPE D: The Intellect-Centered Faculty Member
TYPE E: The Person-Centered Faculty Member

Types A and B are subject-matter-centered instructors. Types D and E are student-centered instructors. Type C, the type most common in the humanities, cannot be characterized as either subject-matter-centered or student-centered in his teaching style.

These distinctions will become clear in the following descriptions illustrating the types.

The Drillmaster

Dr. A has the reputation of being one of the best foreign-language audiolingual instructors in the country. He often gives professional demonstrations at modern language meetings, and visitors to such meetings find Dr. A's classes breathtaking. The tempo in drill work, for example, is subtly varied, regulated to the split second to serve best the precise purposes Dr. A. has set.

In foreign language teaching, drill sessions have played an indispensable role in programs that have adopted the audiolingual approach. (10) The foreign language field is, however, not the only one in which the drillmaster style can be found. It is commonly used in many classes where students must acquire a skill that does not depend on reasoning or learn a body of information by rote. The objective of such sessions is for the student to develop a semi-automatic response to particular kinds of cues. The instructor tries to help the student acquire the ability to respond immediately without having to think. If, therefore, he encourages his students to reason out their response for each exercise, he is teaching against his objective. As a consequence, in the best sessions led by Type-A instructors, the ratiocinative processes are kept at a minimum. The acquisition of a skill, or a body of information, if that is the objective of the course, is attained by drill and repetition rather than by a problem-solving process; clearly it is more economical to attain such knowledge through drill than through the time-consuming processes of discovery or inquiry. On the other hand, if the objective of a course is the acquisition of a skill, or other knowledge that depends on reasoning or involves problem solving--for example, the ability to decide which pieces of data are relevant to a new problem in the field, or the ability to draw generalizations from a new set of particulars--the drillmaster style is obviously not appropriate.

The Berkeley project researchers observed many college classes whre the drillmaster style was used with astonishing results: in elementary piano, second-semester Russian, introduction to logic, and "remedial" English. They also visited some classes in which this teaching style predominated but in which the acquisition of information was the primary objective: A course in Western civilization, a survey of English literature, an art-history course, a study of the world's religions. In these classes, investigators observed students doing little besides reciting answers giving definitions, explanations, and generalizations they had memorized from one or more books or from the instructor's lectures.

In the drillmaster style, whether a skill or a body of information is being taught, theinstructor is the ultimate authority, and the student has few choices open to him or demanded of him. There are no decisions for him to make; with few exceptions, there is only one acceptable response to each cue that is given him. This is the major difference between Type A andthe instructor types that remain to be discussed. Type B, Type C, Type D, and Type E use discovery, inquiry, problem solving, discussion (as opposed to "recitation" in Type-A classes), and regular or periodic formal lectures. These four faculty types thus have much in common. Each teaching style is nevertheless distinguishable in significant ways from each of the others. As the following pages show, Dr. B, Dr. C, Dr. D, and Dr. E each has his own view of the teaching-learning process and each of these views demands a different kind of behavior from the instructor and from his students. Moreover, while each of these instructors, including also Dr. A, pursues excellence, within his own framework, the criteria by which one kind of excellence may be compared with another depend largely upon one's philosophy of relevance.

The Content-Centered Faculty Member

Dr. B happens to be an art historian, but he is an excellent representative of the content-centered instructor type. In shop talk with Dr. B, one is immediately struck by the fact that he does not find either his task or his discipline ambiguous. His task, he says, is to cover the materials of his discipline systematically in order to help his students master them. And he is quite clear on which subject matter ought to be covered, how topics are to be arranged, and what students in each of the courses offered by his department should achieve. He believes that courses carrying the same label on different campuses should cover the same general topics. A course labeled "Classic and Early Christian Art" or "Modern Art," for example, ought to cover the same subject matter, whether it is given on his campus or on another. He has therefore resisted efforts in his department to introduce non-standard ways of organizing the material of his field.

Just as Dr. B has a clear sense of his own role, that of teacher, so he has a clear sense of the student's role. The student is there to learn. Dr. B believes that the view sometimes put forward by students about the teaching-learning process, namely, thatit ought to consist of "joint inquiry," is nonsense. Occasionally, when joint inquiry appears to take place in Dr. B's class, it is in fact merely a pedagogic device by which he helps a student arrive at a solution to a prestructured problem.

Dr. B thus places his emphasis on the student's mastery of the material that has already been discovered by workers in his field. In other words, his students are led to answers, or are given answers directly, that are already known and agreed upon by scholars like Dr. B. The notion that the professor can "learn" something during a class discussion with undergraduates appears utterly foreign to Dr. B's conception of teaching and learning.

There are two basic conceptions that underlie Dr. B's view of himself as a teacher and his activity in the classroom. When Dr. B envisions the ideal student, the perfect product of his efforts, a fairly static image emerges. More important, the image is identical for all students. It pictures someone who has perfectly mastered the subject matter that Dr. B has presented in the course and has assigned for out-of-class study. The second conception basic to Dr. B's view of the teaching-learning process is that the change taking place in the students in his classss is a more-or-less identical process for all the students. It is a movement from relative ignorance to relative knowledge. For example, when a student takes his Primitive Art course, which deals with the arts of Africa, Polynesia, and pre-Columbian America, Dr. B envisions students entering the course knowing next to nothing about the arts of those cultures and moving slowly, under his tutelage, from this state of ignorance to a state of knowledge.

Dr. B prefers an emotion-free atmosphere in his classroom. An aura of scholarly objectivity and non-involvement surrounds his person, and a cool, rational approach to problems characterizes his classroom as well as his person. His relationship to students, both in class and out, is cool and distant, although not unfriendly. And students are quick to sense that a private space, which they may not penetrate, encircles Dr. B wherever he goes.

Since he is also a department chairman, theinterviewer asked him what he looks for when he recruits faculty members.

"Oh," he replied, "the candidate's reputation in the field is of course the main thing. Or in a young man, promise and potential. Of course he should have certain other qualifications as well. He ought to be articulate and patient. And he should be capable of getting along well with colleagues."

Project visitors to Dr. B's classes did not find him the most exciting teacher they had every seen, but they concluded that no student would find cause for complaint. The materials Dr. B deals with are intrinsically interesting, and he has the intelligence not to get in their way.

The Instructor-Centered Faculty Member

Dr. C is a professor of English literature and one of the most talked-about faculty members on his campus. He is a critic for one of the widely circulated national magazines and his name is a household work among intellectuals.

The major role he plays in his classroom is that of a model, demonstrating to his students what he believes are the best ways of apprehending the works and handling the concepts of literature. For Dr. C it is not the subject matter of a field that ought to be at the center of class activity, but what an instructor does with that subject matter. Nor is it mastery of subject matter that his students are expected to work at as their primary goal. It is rather the ability to demonstrate in papers and examinations that they can imitate Dr. C's ways of conceiving of problems, defining them, formulating them, reasoning about them, and handling data pertinent to them. Like Dr. B, he sees teaching as mainly the transmission of knowledge; but there is nevertheless a difference. When Dr. B conceives of knowledge, he thinks of the fruits of knowledge; that is, he conceives of knowledge as a product. Dr. C sees knowledge as process.

The class time in Dr. C's courses is used entirely for two activities: Lectures, which Dr. C characterizes as "a kind of demonstration," and question-and-answer periods, which he refers to as "discussion." The discussions do not generally involve extended dialog between instructor and students. Most often students use the after-lecture discussion period to challenge Dr. C;s approach or point of view. He obviously enjoys these challenges and encourages them; and, as he is an excellent showman, he almost always emerges victorious.

Dr. C is interested in the teaching process, has a coherent conception of what his role as teacheris, plays a completely central role in the class, prepares for that role with great diligence, and obviously enjoys being in the limelight. He gives the impression of authority and independence which attracts students--he has, indeed, a charisma--and he takes seriously the education of undergraduates. During out-of-class discussions with students, Dr. C responds warmly to them, especially to those who show warmth for him. He has rapport with many students, even though all conversation with them begins with him and his ideas and, sooner or later, moves back to him and his ideas.

Like Dr. B, Dr. C is generally satisfied with the standard grading system. He uses a single grading criterion: the exactitude with which students demonstrate in examination exercises that they can imitate his approaches, perspectives, conceptions, and formulations; or, alternatively, the degree to which they imitate figures whom Dr. C admires. Such figures include critics of literature whose work Dr. C recommends. Dr. C impressed project investigators as a unique personality, with ideas about which he feels passionately and which he expresses with verve, originality, great seriousness, and infectious humor.

The difference between the Type-B and Type-C faculty member is exactly the difference Daniel Bell draws between a scholar and an intellectual.(11) A scholar, he says, "has a bounded field of knowledge, a tradition, and seeks to find a place in it, adding to the acculualated, tested knowledge of the past as to a mosaic." The intellectual, on the otherhand, "begins with his experience, his individual perceptions of the world, his privileges and deprivations, and judges the world by these sensibilities." That distinction states the most significant difference about the teaching styles of these two types. The best Type-B class sessions, even when they are conducted by rather different instructors, look very much the same. The instructors keep out of the way of their materials and carry on their classroom work in similar fashion. The project investigators found that a session with one Type-B instructor on a given topic was very much like a session devoted to the same topic conducted by a Type-B colleague of his. They found the reverse true of Type-C instructors: each had a different perspective, and a class session with a Type-C instructor was never similar to another instructor's class session on the same topic.

Dr. C's teaching philosophy goes hand in hand with his belief that in each department there ought to be a diversity of teacher models. Among his departmental colleagues in English literature, for example, several represent schools of criticism completely different from his own;and a few do not engage in literary criticism per se, being of that generation when the literary scholar was trained to engage in value-free historical research. Since no single faculty member could serve as the model for the several major styles of inquiry in the field of literature, Dr. C believes the undergraduate should be subjected to a variety of faculty models. In this way, the faculty do not reinforce one another's biases; and while their modes of treatment may present a welter of diversity to the student, he will at least emerge from the experience realizing that no single perspective or single mode of inquiry is universally accepted in the field as the right road.

Many faculty members in humanistic studies wonder, however, whether such diversity is educationally sound. Among them, a number hold the view that the undergraduate ought to be presented with a single esthetic and critical framework--any respectable one will do and ought to work at it in sufficient depth, rigor, and intensity to enable him to master it and use it with ease. Dr. D holds this view. Indeed, this philosophic difference between Dr. C and Dr. D accounts in large part for their great differences in teaching style.

The Intellect-Centered Faculty Member

Dr. D believes in training of a particularly rigorous intellectual sort. Because he is in a department where the faculty represent a wide variety of perspectives and modes of inquiry, Dr. D finds that, with the exception of a few disciples, he does not have students long enough under his tutelage to be able to carry his program of training through to a satisfactory conclusion. He is, however, highly successful with those students who become his disciples and, fortunately for his state of morale, even this limited success is a source of great satisfaction to him.

Like Dr. C, Dr. D distinguishes sharply between knowledge as product and knowledge as process. As a member of an interdisciplinary department of humanities on his campus, he condemns the courses in his department that derive from the conception of knowledge as product. He believes the focus of class activity should be shifted. The teaching-learning process must not limit itself to a study of the products of rational activity; it should concentrate on rational activity itself. In Dr. D's courses, the emphasis is on the how and why of knowledge rather than the what.

Dr. D was asked whether, for his point of view to be effective, it did not have to be adopted by the other faculty members within his own department.

"That's the difficulty," he replied. "not merely in my own department. To be really effective, it must be adopted by the whole college!"

Since Type-D instructors are primarily concerned with the intellectual development of students, analysis and problem solving constitute their basic teaching means and the major devices they use in testing students. Whether a Type-D faculty member teaches a traditionally academic subject--for example, literary history or criticism, philosophy, art or music, history or criticism, history of ideas--or a subject in the performing and creative arts (for example, creative writing, drama, dance, plastic arts, music), his emphasis remains intellectual. He characteristically does not concern himself with detailed coverage of the field but concentrates on one or several modes of analysis, teaching students how to approach and apprehend artworks rather than transmitting a body of knowledge about them. Often his examination will consist of presenting one or more new works, never discussed in the class sessions, asking students to apply to them the same modes of analysis that he and the class have worked through together in discussing and analyzing the works covered in the class sessions.

The Person-Centered Faculty Member

Dr. E shares much in common with Dr. D, for both are student-centered faculty members. But he believes that Dr. D's emphasis on intellectual development and on rational activity can only, in the long run, prove destructive to the student--or at best, ineffective. Dr. E does not believe that intellectual development ought to be split off from other aspects of the human personality; moreover, if an instructor succeeds in effecting such a split, Dr. E believes such an instructor does the learner harm.

In spite of this major difference between them, Dr. D and Dr. E share a fundamental assumption. Both believe that a philosophy of teaching must be undergirded by a theory of human development, that is, a theory of how men achieve their fullest powers of humanness. Dr. D. believes thatone can keep, and ought to keep, the two "developmental" cycles separate: progress in academic matters, on the one hand, and progress in non-academic problems (problems of identity and of intimacy), on the other. Dr. E insists that these two cycles mustbe maintained in a dynamic relationship, each supporting the other. If this is so, Dr. E argues, then both growth cycles become the concern of the college teacher; and if the college teacher is not qualified or not willing to deal with the non-academic cycle, then the whole growth process as the college student moves into adulthood is placed in jeopardy. The choice open to college teachers is clear, Dr. E asserts; if they do not wish to concern themselves with the development of the student as a person, then they must be content to play no significant part in his education at all. Since most college faculty members do not wish--or are not qualified--to work with the student as a person, it is not surprising, Dr. E points out, that according to the research evidence, faculty members have not had a significant impact on the development of college students. (12)

Since he does not hesitate to voice this point of view publicly, Dr. E is not popular among many of his colleagues. Nor are they, by any means, silent. When he charges them with mistaking a set of ceremonial acts for an educational process, they accuse him of lowering academic standards. The likelihood is that Dr. E would be quite uncomfortable, since the faculty climate on his campus supports his more conservative colleagues, were it not for the fact that his field is dramatic arts. Moreover, his department, widely known for the high calibre of its work is responsible primarily for courses on the performance level, having made an agreement about ten years ago with the English faculty that the traditional courses in the history and criticism of dramatic literature would be offered by the English department.

Though he has no formal training in psychology, Dr. E is conversant with recent personality theory. He seems to know the work of Erik Erikson and Nevitt Sanford. During interviews, he stressed his conception of what a student does when he "learns" something. His comments on this point can be summarized as follows. A student does not learn unless he is challenged. A challenge isnot simply a matter of proper motivation. It is related to the task. A challenging task not only elicits from the student a desire to do it but also demands that he use resources and strategies he has not used in doing other tasks. When a student is given an assignment that he can manage with his existing repertoire of responses, he will use it. There is no challenge in such an assignment; nor is there any growth. But if the student is faced with a situation he cannot manage with his existing repertoire of responses, he must invent or find new ones. If these work, they are integrated with the rest of his personality.

According to Dr. E's analysis, there is little challenge in most assignments students receive in their college courses. Freshmen enter college, for example, having learned in previous school experiences how to memorize facts presented by others and generalizations formulated by others. Many college courses require them to memorize still more facts and principles. Since they already possess a way of organizing experience to meet such demands, there is no need for them to seek a more complex way to fulfill these assignments.

In this way, the "educational" process may actually do harm. If the student discovers that his existing behavioral structure is adequate to meet the demands put upon it by the assignments his instructors give him, he tends to resist any other pressures to expand that structure. Thus, instead of joining non-curricular forces on compus that urge the student to expand, to develop new resources, and to discover himself and the world, his academic experiences may function in just the opposite way.

THIRTEEN KEY QUESTIONS

Similarities and differences between and among these five teaching styles may beseen more easily if one attempts to answer, for each of them, these thirteen questions:

1. When the faculty member draws a fairly concrete mental picture of the ideal "product" emerging from his courses--that is, students who complete the courses and undergo precisely the changes the instructor had hoped for--is the image identical for all students?

2. When the faculty member conceives of the changes he wishes to effectin students--the kinds of changes, the direction of change and the like--does he imagine that those students who reach the goals he has set for them have changed, basically, in the same way?

3. Does class activity concern itself almost exclusively with cognitive knowledge? Or does class activity reflect also significant attention to knowledge that is in the affective domain?

4. In his efforts to help students acquire knowledge, does the instructor transmit mainly the fruits of knowledge? Does he see knowledge primarily as product, or does he also see knowledge as process?

5. Is the activity carried on in class and the activity students perform to prepare for the class session and for examinations almost always of a rational nature, characterized by the formulation of concepts and explanations, and by reasoning, generalizing, and particularizing? Or is there significant attention given to the irrational and the non-rational?

6. Are decisions about the selection and sequence of topics and the organization of class sessions made solely by the instructor? Or does he seek advice from his students

during the course of the class session, or give responsibility to the group for any of these decisions?

7. Is the instructor particularly and explicitly concerned with communication between each student and his classmates?

8. Do lectures by the instructor or by guests, or lecture-like presentations such as educational films, play a significant role in the class sessions?

9. In a dialog between student and instructor during discussions and question-and-answer periods, is the student often an initiator? Or does the instructor almost always initiate the dialog by asking a question, requesting a reaction, or setting a problem?

10. Does the instructor often model the learning process or the process of discovery?

11. Does the instructor use the pressures felt by the student group, and opinions expressed by it, to motivate individuals in it.

12. Are cooperative projects, involving two or more students, often undertaken as an integral part of the work to be done for the course?

13. Is the faculty member generally satisfied with the standard testing and grading system?

For four of these questions (#1, 3, 5, and 12), Dr. B, Dr. C, and Dr. D. basically agree, while Dr. E stands alone in his response.

For four others (#2, 4, 9, and 10) Dr. C, Dr. D, and Dr. E agree, while Dr. B stands alone in his response.

Of the five remaining questions (#6, 7, 8, 11, and 13) Dr. B and Dr. C are in agreement, while Dr. D and Dr. E disagree with the other two but basically agree with one another.

Since Dr. A's classes are not characterized by inquiry or by lecture and discussion, a large number of these questions that do apply, however, Dr. A's answers are identical with Dr. B's. (13)

WHO IS THE BEST TEACHER?

Is one of the five teaching styles better for humanistic studies than the others? The answer is that the prototypes described here are neither good nor bad in themselves. Within each of the styles, it is possible to find excellent teachers and poor teachers. Thus each style has its own excellence, and the problem facing the young instructor entering the field is not an easy one. How is he to judge whether one or another kind of excellence is the one he should pursue? His basic criterion must arise out of his definition of relevance.

As an example, if he were to accept the "Fais ce que voudras" philosophy presented earlier in this chapter, then it is evident that Dr. E's style is the only one of the five that fits that particular definition of relevance. It is also evident, however, that not every young instructor in humanistic studies (even those under 30!) would choose to organize the teaching-learning process around encounter andinvolvement, or insist that it is the instructor's duty to encourage in students a sense of commitment.

Nonetheless, whethertheproblem of relevance is faced in that way or in some other way, it must be directly faced. A devoted teacher cannot do otherwise. "Only in the humanities," William C. DeVane has observed, "does theold ideal of the productive scholar who is at the same time a devoted classroom teacher still flourish." (14) On one point, surely, there is universal agreement among humanists in the academic world: humanities faculties must seek the wisdom and strength necessary to maintain that old ideal in the grim years ahead.

Suggestions for Further Reading

For readers who are unacquainted with the literature of the field, there are two simultaneous starting points: books about higher education as a social institution and the people who participate in it, and the literature written specifically for practitioners in the reader's own discipline. If he is in the field of English, hi might start with John C. Gerber, John H. Fisher, and Curt A. Zimansky (Eds.), The College Teaching of English (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965) and Michael F. Shugrue, English in a Decade of Change (New York: Pegasus, 1968); and those two volumes will provide guidance for further reading. A foreign language teacher might start with the MLA-ACTFL Materials Center list, which he can obtain from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, 10011. Teachers in the fine arts might start with the excellent essays in a recent AAHE report to the National Endowment for the Arts, Lawrence E. Dennis and Renate M. Jacob, The Arts in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Ball, 1968). And faculty members in philosophy and in general humanities could do no better than to start with Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education (New York: Columbia, 1966), available now in paperback.

The other starting point ought to be the monumental collection of essays compiled by Nevitt Sanford, The American College (New York: Wiley, 1962), now also available in paperback, and Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968). The 1968 AAHE yearbook, G. Kerry Smith (Ed.), Stress and Campus Response (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968) has a group of essays on student activism and curricular relevance that greatly illuminate these problems.

Teachers of humanistic studies interested in the special problems of the "creative" student are referred to chapter 10, "Education for Creativity," of Nevitt Sanford, Where Colleges Fail (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967), and Paul Heist (Ed.), The Creative College Student: An Unmet Challenge (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968).

Finally, attention is called to a supurb collection of essays, quite unlike any of the works already mentioned, edited by Arthur A. Cohen a few years ago to honor Robert M. Hutchins' sixty-fifth birthday, Humanistic Education and Western Civilization (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

References Cited

1. James R. Squire, "The Running Water and the Standing Stone," PMLA, June , 1968, 523-29.

2. Joseph Katz, The Student Activists:Rights, Needs, and Powers of Undergraduates. (New Dimensions in Higher Education series.) Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967. (See also ch. 6 of Joseph Axelrod, Mervin B. Freedman, Winslow R. Hatch, Joseph Katz, and Nevitt Sanford, Search for Relevance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.) Richard Flacks,"Student Power and the New Left." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 1969.

3. Quoted in Katz, op. cit.

4. This approach often has the disadvantage of structuring "problems" facing society in accordance with the biases of the middle-class. See the author's "An Experimental College Model," Educational Record, Fall, 1967, p. 336.

5. Based on a comment made by Frank Bardacke, graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, in his presentation as a member of a symposium on "The Persistent Student Voice in the Contempory University." Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, September, 1968.

6. See Jan Kott, Shakespeare Our Contempary (Anchor Books); Kai-yu Hsu, Twentieth-Century Chinese Poetry (Garden City: Doubleday, 1963), pp. 338-342; and Ralph J. Gleason, "Bob Dylan: Poet to a Generation," This World (San Francisco Chronicle magazine section), August 18, 1968, p.33.

7. At a meeting of the Higher Education Colloquy, February 6, 1969, on the campus of the University of California, Berkeley.

8. See Joseph J. Schwab, The College Curriculum and Student Protest. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969; Axelrod et al, op. cit., chs. 4 and 5.

9. Joseph Axelrod, The Freedom to Learn: A Framework for Studying and Reforming the Curricular-Instructional Subsystem in American Colleges. Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969 (Mimeographed). An interim

report appeared under the title "Curricular Change: A Model for Analysis," in *Research Reporter* (Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California), III, 3 (December, 1968), pp.1-4.

10. For a brief exposition of theprinciples of the audio-lingual approach, see Appendix A, "The Audiolingual Approach in College Language Teaching," in Joseph Axelrod and Donald N. Bigelow, *Resources for Language and Area Studies in the United States*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1962. For a stimulating discussion of the most recent source of controversy in the field, see a symposium by Guillermo del Olmo, Swight Bolinger, and Victor E. Hanzeli, "Professional and Pragmatic Perspectives on the Audiolangual Approach," *Foreign Language Annals*, II, 1 (October, 1968), pp. 19-50.

11. Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology*. New York: Free Press, 1960, pp. 372ff.

12. Evidence acculated over the last forty years is presented in summary form in Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, *The Impacts of College on Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

13. A detailed analysis of the responses to the Thirteen Questions appears in the author's report of the project he directed at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California (see footnote 9), chapter 5.

14. William C. DeVane, "The College of Liberal Arts," in Robert S. Morison (ed.) *The Contemporary University: U. S. A.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1966, p. 7.

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT
THE TEACHING OF WORKS OF LITERARY ART

by Wallace W. Douglas*

There is a fitting beginning for this paper in a remark in one of those perceptive reports on the ways of teachers and schools that Joseph Featherstone has been publishing in the New Republic. In a passage on the correcting of children's writings (that odd business on which English teachers expend so much time and energy), Featherstone notes

> --that a central part of teaching is relationships between people, which are always impossible to speak of in a general way. The finest analytical nets will never land a pure example of good teaching, any more than they will deliver up pure specimens of friendship or love. We are condemned to rough impressions, which nearly always float up to the level of platitudes about as useful as advising people not to take any wooden nickels. (1)

In ordinary matters such a notion as Featherstone's would by now have achieved the status of "a truth universally acknowledged." But the schools, especially those of the higher sort, are not ordinary matters by any means, and no doubt some, or even many, persons connected with education would find something disturbing, not to say radical, in what Featherstone has to say about their way of life, should they happen to notice it.

It is to be hoped that not too many readers will be affected in that way. For in truth Featherstone's remark is important here only as a means of setting some limits to the subject in hand--which seems to lie somewhere among the following topics: The teaching of literature as one of the humanities, the teaching of literature in a humanistic fashion, and perhaps even the humane teaching of literature. These topics do not contain questions of a qualitative sort about what constitutes worthy or adequate performance in the teaching of literature. They do not lead to descriptions of the good, better, and best ways of doing what is done. They do not ask how many days in a survey course should be devoted to Book I of the Faerie Queene, or even whether some other book or books are to be preferred. They do not ask how many or how few biographical facts a freshman will need to understand the Intimations Ode, as opposed to the number a senior or graduate student will need to comprehend "Wordsworth" or "Romanticism." They do not even ask teachers to choose between the lecture (well organized and vigorously delivered) and the discussion (desultory and uninformed) as the form of their teaching "method."

---

*Dr. Douglas is Director, The Curriculum Center in English, Northwestern University.

Before we ask how well and adequately we use our techniques and materials, we need to ask now--and perhaps even whether--they are related to the nature of the materials that are used in English classes, to the interests of those who use them, or to the social situation in which they are used. On the whole, it does not seem that these base questions have ever been very much thought about by those who have written on the teaching of literature. The late W. R. Parker once remarked that "English" has never really been defined as a discipline. (2) And perhaps it is not too much to say that at all levels of schooling, "English" is merely certain slots in the school timetable that are so denominated, and the reasons for what goes on in any one of them are not easily determinable. For as Parker also said,

> Our profession as scholars demonstrates richly the lessons learned from four centuries of experience; our profession as teachers is still wrestling strenuously and confusedly with initial problems that mass education has suddenly and greatly aggravated. As scholars we have matured; as teachers we--the same people--are still children in our ignorance, still fumbling and faddish and lacking in understanding. (3)

So, like Aristotle, let us follow the natural order and begin with the primary facts.

I

Fifteen years ago Ronald Crane thought that it could be taken for granted that

> --we are all pretty well agreed on what, in a concrete sense, we should like to see result from our

> endeavors, in the way of newly acquired skill and knowledge in our students. We want these students, whatever their intentions in life, not only to have fixed in their memories a certain number of excellent literary works and a certain body of essential facts about their historical relations, but also to carry away from their experience with us a more eager inclination to read literature for its own sake than they brought to it. (4)

Probably most of those now teaching literature would set forth their understanding of the purposes of their craft or their art in terms rather similar to Crane's. But in the last 5 years or so, some people (5) have begun to find it necessary to speculate about the second part of his dictum, to begin to ask to what extent their present activities can rationally be expected to produce "a more eager inclination to read literature for its own sake." In brief, thequestion is can a single set of teaching practices be designed or even conceived that will both fix in theminds of young people "a certain number of excellent literary works and a certain body of essential facts about their historical relations" and also and at the same time "give them a more eager inclination to read literature for its own sake"? The operative works arenot just "eager inclination" but also--and more important--"for its own sake." And using Panofsky's words, one might ask whether studying works of literary art as documents is likely (at least by itself) to encourage students to acquire the skill and sensibilities necessary to comprehinding them as monuments, as objects of esthetic interest and attention.

Evidently this problem has been with teachers for some time. In the last decade of the 19th century, John Churton Collins, a devoted apologist and polemicist for the then still new college subject of English, was complaining over its already sad state, the wide disparity between the announced objectives of those professing it and their actual accomplishments.

> To all appearances, indeed, there is no branch of education in a more flourishing condition or more full of promise for the future. But, unhappily, this is very far from being the case. In spite of its great vogue, and in spite of the time and energy lavished in teaching it, no fact is more certain that than from an educational point of view it is, and from the very first has been, an utter failure. Teachers perceive with perplexity that it attains none of the ends which a subject in it-

> self so full of attraction and interest might be expected to attain. It fails, they complain, to fertilize; it fails to inform; it fails even to awake curiosity. For a dozen youths who derive real benefit from theinstruction they get in preparing for an examination in History there are not two who derive the smallest benefit from the instruction they getin preparing for an examination in Literature.(6)

Perhaps the cause of Churton Collins' dismay lies just there, in his evidently easy analogizing of history and English, to say nothing of his equally easy assumption that in both cases the essence of study is "the instruction they get in preparing for an examination."(7) Perhaps the problem is a condition of the very being of "English"; at any rate, it certainly seems to be a condition of its origin.

II

Formal academic study, at collegiate level, of the native language and literature began in England early in the second quarter of the 19th century, in the United States about 25 or 30 years later. In both countries there had occurred an actual qualitative change in the material conditions of living, which made important demands on the enculturating apparatus of the State. These were met in part by the establishment of municipal universities in England and of state universities and various sorts of new colleges in the United States. (8) To these new institutions there came many who did not have Latin or Greek and who were thus deprived of access to the classics, which for a millennium and more had given to men of affairs and their functionaries

> a common shared experience of a limited canon of significant works, belletristic and other .... (These were the) standard works which had best defined the duties of a moral person and an active, responsible citizen--of a free man guiding the destinies of his society.(9)

For obvious reasons it was thought necessary (as Arnold was never tired of telling his kind) that these young men be given the body of cultural references and assumptions that study of the classics had given those in whose hands control of schooling still rested. Eventually it was seen that at least certain works of English literature contained much of what was sought, or at least could be made to. As one schoolman put it,

> It is, however, in connection with what is called "middle-class education" that the claims of English

> literature may bemost effectively urged. In that literature, properly handled, we have a most valuable agency for the moral and intellectual culture of the professional classes. By means of that literature it seems to me that we might act very beneficially on the national mind, and do much to refine and invigorate the national character. The student will learn ... that the world is a good deal wider than his own sect, party, or class.(10)

The teachers of the new subject were a fairly mixed bag, it seems: clergymen, journalists, secondary school teachers, and college professors of rhetoric (because of its then current association with belles lettres), history (because literature was thought to be somehow an adjunct of history, a relationship that still obscurely exists), philosophy, and the classics. In the United States the typical English professor of the time has been described as "a doctor of divinity who spoke and wrote themother tongue grammatically, had a general 'society knowledge' of literature, and had not specialized in this or any other academic subject."(11) Such a figure could operate effectively when "English" was merely a series of lectures, given as a kind of "poor man's Classics,"(12) a means of providing a substitute cultural continuity, to a class of people who were literate only in the native tongue and, perhaps, some modern foreign language. But of course such simple and primitive conditions could not long exist after English studies were institutionalized as departments and thus became involved in the long and complex dying of classical literary studies as the central element in general, humane education.

If they were to achieve a secure place within academic society, the professors of English studies had to be able to meet as equals in professionalization their colleagues in other departments, perhaps especially those in classics, to whose dominant position in academic government and, in some sense, to whose very existence as members of the commonwealth of learning the new men in English must have been a fairly obvious threat. In the circumstances English teachers did not really have much choice as between advancing "science and learning" and mere schoolkeeping," as the ancient task of providing "a general and rather elementary education for gentlemen" was coming to be regarded.(13) In the United States, the nature of the choice may have been made even more certain after the invention of Freshman English; this may have helped consolidate the academic power of English departments, but it could have done little to decrease the schoolmaster image of their members. In the United States the heady notions about scholarship that were coming out of Hopkins must also have done much to enforce and rationalize the way English professors were choosing to develop their activities.

All things considered, it is not surprising that English teachers turned to the scholarship of their classical colleagues as a model for their own. After all what else had they? Of course, as Parker reminded us,(14) there were three centuries or so of various sorts of scholarly work on English language and literature. But since that work appears to have been derived from the modes of Hellenistic scholarship anyway, the model would still have been "classical," even if the new men of English had found native scholarship sufficiently systematic and developed to be thought of as a model. Over the years then English teachers took for their stock in trade the full range of work that classical literature had for centuries been producing for scholars. They did philological and lexicographical investigation, textual criticism, annotation, and interpretation, biographical and historical study, andso forth. The result has been, of course, the accululation or creation of an impressive body of information and knowledge; in short of a science, a subject for teaching.

There is a kind of Parkinson's Law that operates here: whenever a body of knowledge is accumulated, a science created, it becomes necessary to transmit its components. The guild has to be perpetuated, though in this case it is not especially clear why perpetuation of the scholarly tradition should determine the content and technique of the undergraduate studies of young people, only a few of whom can be expected to minister to the assumed cultural needs of newly schooled and literate folk, managed gradually to turn themselves into purveyors of various sorts of information about the works of literary art that, presumably, it had been supposed would be the means of their ministrations. Perhaps it is not too much to say that duringthe first 50 years of so of their existence as a formal academic subject, English studies were so far divested of the informing spirit of studies in litterae humaniores, from which they are descended, as to become merely a discipline, or even just a technical training, for the production of scholars.

III

In matters of practice, the divestiture has been nearly if not quite complete. And as scholars with a subject to purvey, English teachers have been able to discuss their major career responsibility as an abstration--"teaching"--rather separate from the nature of their materials and, indeed, also from at least some of their objectives. They have seen their teaching simply as communicating in a public situation some portions of a body of knowledge to a relatively uninformed audience, individual members of which will be ranked according to their ability or willingness to fix in their memories whatever they have been able to judge to have been important in the view of the speaker. But this is essentially a rhetorical model, which is why Quintilian can still have so much to say to literature teachers. And many things--not least the English teacher's own claims for the importance to moral and ethical growth of the experience of literary works (but the study of literature?), to say nothing of Aristotelian and modern distinctions between art and science --suggest that such a model cannot quite encompass the fullness of "English."

For the fact is that even the most scholastic of English scholars seem not entirely comfortable with the idea of English as a subject just like any otherin the curriculum-- say history or soil mechanics. Or rather perhaps they cannot be easy viewing themselves as doing the same sort of thing as professors in fields with less ancient connections. For English teachers all carry around as part of their intellectual baggage a good many traces of high romantic theories about the nature and effect of literary works and of the literary experience. On the one hand, as scholars studying literary works for the sake of the knowledge to be accumulated, they want students to know something of their own and others' results ("a certain number of excellent literary works and a certain body of essential facts about their historical relations"). On the other hand, English teachers are also, though perhaps unwittingly, heirs of the 19th century tradition in literary discussion, which found the value of literary works to be in the refining and humanizing effect they might have on the imaginations and, ultimately, the intellects of men, especially those who might otherwise remain confined in "that narrowness which is too often the consequence of a life attached, from theearliest age, to the pursuit of lucre."(15) Furthermore nearly all English teachers are to some degree aware that the materials they use (books, literary works, texts) are, for better or worse, works of art, with all that they know or feel that that should imply. Therefore English teachers pretty generally assert that they want their students to change and also to intensify and refine their responses to literary works, for whatever moral and ethical development may be traced to them ("to carry away from their experience with us a more eager inclination to read literature for its own sake").

But the trouble is that it is very difficult to see how both these ends can be attained by a model that expresses teaching as the transmission of information. On the other hand it is very difficult to see anywhere any model for teaching English more satisfactory than the present rhetorical one. And it is still more difficult to think of how to go about fashioning a new one. Most difficult of all is just seeing that there may be a need to do something about what exists. After all, thepresent model has been around for a long time, perhaps since that early research institute, the Museum at Alexandria, where, it is said, Cleopatra herself listened to lectures and participated in discussions, no doubt to their considerable enlivenment. Moreover in the colleges today, the rhetorical model is the general guide for teaching practice everywhere except perhaps for studio courses in the arts. Finally since the scholarly activities of English teachers are so well rewarded these days, it is perhaps no wonder that they tend to think that acquiring the results of scholarship provides students an experience similar in nature and value to that of comprehending a work of literary art.

In the circumstances and considering the rigidity of the mythology, the validating system, of English teaching, perhaps only a direction for change can be suggested, and that only by means of questions. First, what would be the consequences in practice if English teachers took more account of the nature of what is, after all, the basis of all their scholarship--that is, a certain number of works of verbal art (or verbal objects), made in different times and places, which for some reason or other are deemed to possess value or to be capable of becoming the occasions of intrinsically valuable experiences? Second, how can such literary works become objects of attention, and of esthetic attention at that, in a collegiate setting? Third, how can a meaningful relationship be developed between young people and, again, "a certain number of excellent literary works," to the end of expanding and refining not merely the responses in which comprehension of such works is expressed, but also the more general responses by which men express their common humanity.

The argument here is that teachers need to re-examine their "objectives" or purposes. They have been stated often enough, and adequately. What is necessary is that they examine the materials and the techniques by which they seek to accomplish the ends set for them which, indeed, they have set for themselves. This is necessary because, whether they see it yet or not, they are right now, as Harvey Cox says, "in the midst of a profound professional identity crisis."(16) Of course, since English departments are still large and apparently flourishing (as they seemed already to be when Churton Collins wrote in 1891), action can probably be put off a little while longer. But there is the warning of the classics; even before the Oxford English School had been established, R. L. Nettleship was concerned about the danger contained in the obvious resemblance between English and classical studies:

> The discussions about (a school of modern literature at Oxford) make me feel how very little the classics owe their position in education to their being literature, for the first thing theordinary person says is, "For heaven's sake don't let us murder Shakespeare, etc., by treating them as we treat Aeschylus and Sophocles." (17)

It is still not clear that teachers have found a way to save themselves, to say nothing of Shakespeare. For though it would be hard to fault the information they convey or their means of doing so, still today many must find ithard to say how they are accomplishing the lofty and humane ends that are asserted to be inherent consequences of collegiate literary studies.

References Cited

1. Joseph Featherstone, "Experiments in Learning," The New Republic, CLIX (14 December 1968), 23-25, at p. 25.

2. William Riley Parker, "Where do English Departments Come From?" College English, XXVIII (February 1967), 339-51, at p. 348.

3. Ibid., p. 342. But note: the very origin of English as a collegiate subject came as a response to the needs of "mass education." Cf. the memorial from 108 members of Oxford Congregation to the Hebdomadal Council (June 1891) on "the inadequate provision at present made by the University for the study of English language and literature":

> The importance of this study, as a part of its education of Englishmen, is now generally recognized. Increasing stress is laid upon it in the Public Schools of the country, in Government Examinations, and in the local Examinations of the University itself. The result if an increasing demand for teachers or lecturers competent to handle the subject efficiently.

Quoted in J. H. Palmer, The Rise of English Studies (Oxford, 1965), p. 107.

The reason that Oxford and Cambridge were "the last universities in theentire English speaking world to establish professorships in English language and literature" was precisely that they were neither concerned with nor troubled by the effects of mass education. (See Parker, "English Departments," p. 344.)

4. Ronald S. Crane, "Questions and Answers in the Teaching of Literary Texts," The Idea of the Humanities and Other Essays Critical and Historical (Two volumes, Chicago, 1967), II, 176-96, at pp. 176-7. The essay is dated 1953.

5. Perhaps including Crane himself; see at least the opening of his "Every Man His Own Critic," Ibid., II, 194-214. The essay is based on a lecture given in 1956.

6. John Churton Collins, The Study of English Literature (London, 1891), p. 17, cited in Palmer, English Studies, p. 65.

7. Cf. some early examination questions in English (Palmer, English Studies, pp.22, 47).

From the first annual examination in English at University College (London), about 1829 or 1830:

> Who is the first distinguished writer of English prose? Point out the characteristic features of his style, and say in what respect it differs from that of Lord Clarndon.

From the first B.A. examination at the University of London (1859):

> Describe briefly the plot of Gorboduc.
> Who wrote Gammer Gurton's Needle? When?
> Trace the plot.

8. See Parker, "English Departments," p. 344.

9. William Riley Parker, "The Future of the'Modern Humanities,'" the closing address at the Jubilee Congress of the Modern Humanities Research Association, held at Cambridge University, 26-30 August 1968, circulated in Newsletter (Mimeograph, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University English Department), III (2 December 1968), 69-81, at p. 71.

10. H. G. Robinson, "On the Use of English Classical Literature in the Work of Education," Macmillian's Magazine II (October 1860), 425-34, at p. 430, cited in Palmer, English Studies, p. 45. Palmer suggests that extension work in English literature was sometimes viewed with quite specific political ends in mind; e.g., as antidotes for popular literature, as a means of combating Chartism, or of meliorating the effects of working conditions in mines and factories (pp. 29, 31, 34).

Note also R. L. Nettleship (a tutor at Balliol) to A. C. Bradley, who was then professor of English Literature at Liverpool, December 1886:

> They are beginning to talk again about a modern literature school here (Oxford). I hope it won't be done in a hurry, but it does seem to me that, if (as seems likely) fewer people are going to learn Greek and Latin, we ought to begin making preparations to supply their place.

(Ibid., p. 83, quoted from D. G. James, "The Teaching of

English in Universities," Universities Quarterly, v (May 1951), 232-38, at p. 232.

11. Parker, "English Departments," p. 346

12. The phrase is Palmer's (English Studies, pp. vii and 78).

13. So, evidently, in the eyes of Mark Pattison (see Palmer, Ibid., p. 77).

14. Parker, "English Departments," pp. 340-1.

15. Rev. Vicesimus Knox, Preface to Elegant Extracts (a school anthology, 1827), in Palmer, English Studies, p. 13.

16. Harvey Cox, "Underground Churches, Underground Schools," Commonweal, LXXXIX (13 December 1968), 376-78, at p. 377.

17. In Palmer, English Studies, p. 83.

TEACHING THE HUMANITIES

by O. B. Hardison, Jr.*

Any sane man asked to comment on the art of teaching will begin with a sense of humility bordering on the abject. Teaching is a creative activity, something that is largely made up as it goes, and until there is a satisfactory explanation of creativity itself, the basis of successful teaching will reamin mysterious. It is not that rules and theories are lacking. The twelve books of Quintilian's Institute of Oratory supplied pedagogues with a nearly crushing burden of rules and theories (most of them very sensible) from ancient times down to the beginnings of the modern educational revolution with Rousseau and Pestalozzi. Since then theories have multiplied, very nearly in the geometric pattern of cells dividing in an ideal culture medium or of neutrons in the chain reaction that precedes an atomic explosion.

Alas, the new theories have not settled much of anything. They havemade life more interesting for educational philosophers, but they have left the teacher stranded on that darkling plain where ignorant (and usually fanatical) armies clash by night. Each new theory comes equipped with its opinion polls to show that teachers by and large have no notion of what they are doing, with its touching examples of gleams of light in the prevailing gloom, and its promises, propped up by masses of statistics, that the method proposed by its author is the ready and easy way to salvation, if only the sinister forces of tradition, habit, conformity, prejudice, vested interest, establishmentarianism, and the like can be destroyed.

The trouble is that a teacher can follow all the rules and still fall flat on his face. Poetry has been definedas what gets left out of the translation of a poem. If so, teaching may be what eludes the statistics and theories of the professors of education. Most people would very likely agree that a good teacher needs knowledge of his subject, intelligence, tact, and kindness. The first of those desiderata, knowledge, is the only one that a teacher can do much about; it is also the one that is most often questioned. The rule book has not been formulated that can teach anybody to be intelligent or tactful or kind. It never will be because these are qualities that show themselves only in specific situations. Tact demands that the teacher treat one student's poor performance with sympathy and another's with severity. It is generally kinder in the long run to allow students to accept full responsibility for what they do, but any teacher or administrator knows that there are innumerable cases where it is better to bend the rules than apply them rigorously. A good student who writes a careless paper has earned a failing grade, and his teacher does him no favor to let him think he has done well; a poor student who has done the best he can probably needs encouragement more than criticism. The point is that no action of the teacher can be judged in the abstract. One could almost say that the better the teacher, the more clearly his actions reflect this fact. The social sciences have yet to produce thier Ptolemy, much less their Issac Newton. Pending this event, the teacher is best advised to go modestly about his business, relying mostly on his developing sense of what works.

---

*Dr. Hardison is professor of English literature, University of North Carolina. He has been designated to become director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington.

The point seldom made by theorists of education is that teaching is a cooperative affair. This is especially true of college teaching where the make-up of a class varies according to the level of the course, the fluctuating interests of students (one year T. S. Eliot is "in" and the next he may be "out"), and even the time and place where the course is scheduled. It is also very likely true that teaching in the humanities tends to be more cooperative than in the sciences. The humanities teacher is usually talking about an experience that he has shared (or hopes he has shared) with his students. While the best teaching in the sciences may tend in this direction, the general emphasis in undergraduate science courses seems to be on moving a body of information along a one-way street from the head of the teacher to the head of the student.

If it is true that teaching in the humanities is cooperative, the teacher cannot assume full responsibility for the degree to which his course is "successful." He needs to be there to light the fire, but the materials have to be flammable in the first place, and the nature of the materials will determine whether the fire is hot and clear or smoulders away, generating more smoke than light. An actor should be infinitely adaptable. He should always play to his audience. But it is an old axiom in the theater that great drama demands great audiences. In the same way, anyone who has done much teaching knows that his sense of accomplishment--the exhilarating sense of having communicated attitudes and enthusiasms as well as the daily quota of information--varies greatly from class to class and even from period to period in the same class.

This is important because many young people entering college teaching today have an almost religious devotion to the ideal of "great teaching." The discovery that the teacher does not fully control the classroom--that a class is a tertium quid created by everyone participating--ought to be as exciting as the physics student's discovery that "pulsars" defy all current attempts at explanation; but often it is simply another disillusionment. Every young teacher wants to be admired by his students, singled out for praise in their course-evaluation booklets, and crowned with laurels by his dean during the award ceremonies at commencement. If he can't achieve these goals entirely on his own, doesn't this mean that "greatness" is a matter of luck--or, as he may begin to suspect over his second highball, a matter of being with the right people?

I, frankly, do not know what "greatness" is when applied to teaching. Normally the epithet "great" is reserved by historians for men who, by virtue of some accomplishment, usually violent and mostly with disastrous consequences for mankind at large, cannot be omitted from the undergraduate history textbooks. At the very least the historian usually waits a decent interval after his man's interment to call him great. As applied to teaching, on the other hand, "greatness" is an instantaneous judgment. Public commendation can be deferred to the funeral, but swift promotion and extra pay are meaningful to the great teacher only while he is alive.

Who recognizes greatness and how? Those who labor patiently in the vineyards, who speak not with the tongues of men and of angels, are inclined to the theory that teaching is largely patient, persistent attention to detail and that greatness should be measured by results. Unfortunately, teaching is not like basketweaving. No course ends with a neat, well-made basket. The results of teaching may take years to show themselves or they may never be measurable at all. Everyone has a story about a teacher he disliked intensely but whose influence proved both permanent and beneficial. I myself once knew a teacher who by all current standards would be considered a total failure. He permitted no class participation, he skirted the edge of incoherence when he lectured, he was given to taking up large chunks of class time by reading bibliographies, and so far as I know, he was innocent of seminal ideas. Yet there was a peculiar intensity and authority about the man that drove his students to heroic efforts when they were not driving the students mad. Today, years after his death, many of his students are recognized as distinguished scholars and highly successful teachers. In some way his influence remains a living force while the influence of a hundred more polished, more amiable teachers who were his contemporaries has disappeared. He could neverhave won an award for great (or, perhaps, even for mediocre) teaching while alive, but if success is best measured by results, he was undeniably a great teacher.

More than likely the historical judgment, as measured by results, is the valid one. The corollary is that preoccupation with "greatness" can be harmful to teachers, courses, and the humanities generally. The teacher must do his job partly on faith.

A second point of view is far more popular than the historical just now. It is common among students and beginning teachers, and it is intensified by the cold war between the generations. Students tend to judge teaching by its "relevance," by which they often mean entertainment. Should they read Plato? Not if he cannot be made relevant, the reply goes. Evidently, they are not to read Plato to enlarge their minds through the experience of his, but to skim through his dialogs--or the excerpts in our anthologies--to find a few sentences here and there that can be salvaged for use in the latest confrontation. Since the young teacher tends to evaluate his success--his "greatness"--on the basis of his popularity he frequently not only endorses this point of view but propagates it. The results are evident in two ways: First, in the increasing emphasis of the humanities curriculum on the present at the expense of the past, and second, in the popularity of course evaluations. That isolation in the present can be as damaging to a culture as isolation from other men can be to an individual is an unfashionable and hence an irrelevant truth, but a tuth, nonetheless. That evaluations are essentially popularity polls disturbs only the unpopular. For the winners the conclusion is inescapable that justice has been done, talent rewarded, virtue vindicated.

Teachers can take comfort, perhaps, in the reflection that although the debate is being carried on in new terms, its substance is as ancient as the debate that Plato mentioned between the poets and the philosophers. Itis a debate essentially, between educational conservatives and educational liberals, and when one sees it in this way the truths on both sides are obvious. The past is important, but this does not mean that classes should be dull; the pursuit of knowledge and beauty for their own sake is a precious human right, but many persons are lured into the appreciation of a Platonic dialog or a play by Shakespeare or a painting by Raphael by a projection, a special feature, that happens to touch their own immediate interests. The notion that, whatever greatness is, the teacher should strive for it will continue to influence students, administrators, the general public, and, mostimportant, the teacher himself. The best course for the beginning teacher is to accept greatness if it is thrust upon him butnot to worry too much if he seems to be heading for "mere competence" rather than greatness. After all, mere competence" is not so commonplace that educators and laymen can afford to treat it with scorn.

To recognize that teaching is creative, that it is a cooperative venture, and that "greatness" has to be taken with a grain of salt is to make the first accommodations that all teachers must eventually make to an imperfect world. It is, basically, to recognize the limitations within which all men, but especially teachers, must work. If it produces a certain humility, it also gives the teacher some protection against the fads and claims of the educationists. This point leads me from the discussion of general principles to the present state of the art.

The new teacher will find that he is entering the profession at a time of almost obsessive experimentation. Industry has contributed to this situation in ways that are not always particularly admirable and will do so increasingly in the future. Educational equipment is highly profitable. Its manufacturers grind out reams of optimistic publicity to convince the innocent that it is capable of solving age-old educational problems. Such equipment now includes program texts in book or book-plus-machine form, machines to teach rapid reading, audiovisual equipment, filmstrips, closed-circuit television installations, and computer-controlled devices ranging from equipment for grading papers to teaching machines. Medical advertisements are strictly controlled by Federal legislation, but there is apparently no regulation of the printed and word-of-mouth publicity for teaching equipment. Yet such equipment is already playing a very large part in higher education. Junior colleges and small, backward liberal arts colleges are very likely most susceptible because their teachers are generally less sophisticated, less able to resist the advertisers' claims, and feel more guilty about their own limitations than teachers at larger institutions. But the larger institutions are by no means immune to exaggerated claims, naive or rigged statistics, the eloquence of the company representative, and above all, the economic argument that machines save manpower. And, of course, not all of the claims are false, and many are not consciously false.

The point is that educational gadgetry profoundly affects education. If, for example, a teacher has a machine for grading papers, he tends to increase class size, eliminate term papers, and give factual rather than essay examinations. The pressure is always there. It is easy to go further but almost impossible to go back. For better or for worse, the teacher will find himself under considerable pressure to use some gadgetry and to justify its use in the name of creative experimentation. It is to be hoped that the humanities can hold out more successfully than other fields against the gadgets, but the truth is that much of the gadgetry is consciously intended for market in the humanities.

Again, higher education has traditionally been suspicious of educational theorists, who have, in turn, concentrated most of their efforts on secondary education. Widespread criticism of college teaching has changed all this. Students are keenly aware from their first days in graduate school that teaching will be their major, if not their only, career responsibility. Most graduate departments now provide informal instruction in the art of college teaching, and courses with credit are becoming common. Meanwhile, encouraged by Federal and foundation grants, educational theorists are rapidly increasing the bibliography of studies of college teaching. It is fashionable to base these studies on polls, and since the polls are often designed on the assumption that there is something drastically wrong with our methods of college teaching, it is perhaps not surprising that the results tend to confirm the assumption. One such poll that reached me about a year ago was supposed to collect information on the attitude of Ph.D.'s toward their graduate training. It was so completely dominated by the notion that the respondents would want to criticize that I found the only part I could fill out was the part asking for academic rank and years of service. I finally had to give up trying to answer and simply wrote a note to the originator of the poll saying that I was acutely embarrassed to have to admit that I enjoyed my graduate work, admired my teachers from a distance that we both found mutually gratifying, and felt the requirements were quite reasonable.

Whatever the originator may have thought of this pathetic display of conformance, I am sure that he did not allow it to affect his results. At any rate, I cite the example merely to illustrate the quandary in which the teacher is likely to find himself today. He has been trained to work in certain well-defined ways, and he is now being told that he is archaic, fails to make use of current educational theory, and ignores student interests, and generally subordinates teaching to research, which is assumed to be mostly irrelevant to his success in the classroom.

Finally, the teacher will find his problems complicated further by pressure to experiment whetherhe likes it or not. Like gadgets, educational experiments threaten to become an end in themselves. These range the gamut from full-scale curricula offered in "free universities" to interdisciplinary courses, special honors curricula, undergraduate seminars, years abroad, team teaching, independent readings, "area studies," credit for off-campus jobs, and the like. The experimentation is reflected in the almost compulsive revisions and re-revisions of the humanities curriculum by both departments and university-wide committees.

While this is a heady situation and many of the experiments are fun, if not demonstrably superior to what they replace, there are obvious dangers. To what degree is the humanities curriculum being formed not by the faculty but by business interests, educationists, and students? To what degree should graduate schools open themselves to courses in the theory and methods of college teaching? Do such courses mean reducing or abandoning the traditional graduate-school emphasis on subject-matter? And has the performance of the educationists at the secondary level been such as to warrant confidence in their ability to reform college education? And finally, at what point in the process of experimentation and course revision does the humanities curriculum cease to exist as a coherent, meaningful body of work and become simply a collection of courses to be taken in any order or combination?

The young teacher cannot escape these questions. Whether he faces them squarely or simply drifts along with whatever happens to be the current fashion, he will be involved in them more deeply than his elders, more deeply, perhaps than any of his predecessors since the Renaissance. It is always possible, of course, thatthe questions are pseudo-questions. The humanities curriculum may reflect such deep internal imperatives that the current period of experimentation will prove to be just that--a period of experimentation after which things will settle back pretty much to their old norm. This may happen at institutions where the humanities continue to be important, while at the others experimentation will weaken an already shaky position and result ultimately in reversion to type--that is, reversion to an old-style polytechnic curriculum broadened to include the social sciences. But no one can be sure. The one thing the young teacher can be sure of is that, in addition to having to come to terms with the mysteries of teaching, he will, in the course of his career, have every one of his most cherished assumptions challenged. Whether he stands for tradition or change, he will have to justify himself before his students in the classroom and before his colleagues in his department and on interdepartmental committees.

Thus far this discussion has concentrated on subjects that are to a degree the concern of every college teacher. They are, however, probably more important to the humanist than to the scientist. In theory, at least, the sciences have an objectivity, a definition that the humanities lack. Presumably, an engineering student has to take calculus. As long as the calculus teacher conveys the essential techniques, it is not crucial whether he is stimulating or boring, "great" or merely adequate. But what do students in general "have to take" in the humanities? A sampling of college catalogs shows that answers range from "nothing at all" to "great books" to "English Lit. Survey" to "X number of elective courses in any department classified under 'Humanities'." In other words, the calculus teacher does not have to face the general questions (this does not mean he should ignore them), but the teacher of literature or music or art must face them.

In a sense most of the specific questions that arise in the teaching of literature, to take a specific example, are corollaries of the general ones. They can, however, be considered in themselves, for they are as clearly reflected in cleavages among schools of literary critics as they are in national debates on the future of American education. The chronological, nationally oriented curricula that still underlie the programs of most departments of modern languages are the products of historical scholarship, the prevailing school in the late nineteenth century when the older departments were formed. Contrary to repeated assertions of its demise, historical criticism still flourishes. It assumes that the study of literature requires a student to assimilate a great deal of information that he will ultimately need for understanding (appreciation is desirable but not essential) literary works. American Studies is the latest and most vigorous offshoot of the historical point of view, in spite of the factthat most American Studies programs are billed as "experimental." Any port in a storm.

At its best the historical ideal involves the love of knowledge for its own sake. It collides head-on with the view that humanistic education should be a form of practical education--education for action. This idea is the one held, apparently, by most ancient and Renaissance educators. In its crudest form it underlies such masterpieces of the textbook writer's art as Aesop's Fables and McGuffey's Reader. A much more sophisticated form appears in the writing of Matthew Arnold and, in this country, Irving Babbitt. Both Arnold and Babbitt consider the humanities, literature in particular, vehicles of human value. The good teacher is more concerned with the values than the works in which they are contained, just as the housewife is presumably more interested in the soup than the can (this is not to deny the importance of packaging). In fact, the teacher tends to choose the works because they reflect certain values rather than because of their literary excellence. The function of the teacher is to make sure that the students recognize the values and, as far as possible ingest them. As a corollary the practical critic is much more likely to be interested in his students as persons than the historical scholar. Ideally, the values should be passed on to the students in small discussion groups.

While the idea that the humanities are repositories of ethical and social value has its attractions, it does not treat humanistic learning as disinterested. And, of course, the values conveyed to the students tend to vary with the person conveying them. The values of Arnold and Irving Babbitt were conservative. Both men regarded literature as a kind of substitute for religion, and both wished to use it to create an elite group--an establishment--who could protect society against the excesses of egalitarian democracy. In the thirties the Communist Party used the same arguments to justify indoctrination through literature in Marxist values. Today, the New Left regards literature as a weapon in the struggle against established values in general. One hears the argument that the basic "value" of art or literature is revolution. To the true believer, the artist is fundamentally radical, and his art is engaged. The teacher should cooperate with him by making this truth not only evident but attractive to students. Disinterestedness, the argument runs, is a disguise for escapism. Objectivity is a mirage; to attempt it is to confess moral cowardice.

The esthetic position, which underlies, for example, much of the New Criticism, treats literature (and art in general) as valuable in itself. In their respect for an activity pursued for its own sake, the apologists of estheticism are allied to the historical critics, but they are bitterly opposed to the idea that literature is an object of quantitative knowledge rather than an imaginative (and pleasurable) experience. The quest for knowledge--for facts --they argue, often becomes an obstacle to esthetic appreciation rather than an aid. Students, they complain, spend more time reading about Shakespeare, Goethe, or Proust than reading the works themselves, with the result that literary study becomes a sterile scrambling after information.

sthetic critics oppose the Arnoldian theory of literature as value on different but equally emphatic grounds. While they agree that art is a repository of value, they argue that the value is esthetic, not ethical or social. From their point of view to use a work--say Oedipus--as a means of teaching the need for an "inner check," or another work --say War and Peace--as a representation of the relation between capitalism and war, is to substitute moral or economic platitudes for enlarging personal experiences. To omit Oedipus from the curriculum to make room for a more "relevant" work like--say--Native Son is even worse. It is to deprive students of the chance to share in one of the major achievements of the imagination of Western man. From this point of view, the curriculum in which works are chosen for relevance rather than excellence guarantees cultural impoverishment. Humanistic education should enrich the individual. It should not condition him but contribute to his freedom.

The young teacher will find that, give and take variations in vocabulary, these three positions remain fundamental in theories of education, studies of the teacher's role, systems of criticism, and designs for humanities curricula. More than likely most teachers end up espousing one thing in theory but groping ahead pragmatically when in the classroom. Judging from the number and loudness of voices raised in its support, the second position--the idea that the humanities are repositories of ethical and social value --is currently in the ascendant. Outside of the university the favored value-system is conservative and ethical, while within the favored system is radical and political. This situation has already led to embittered confrontations between legislatures and college faculties and between students and administrators. Whether the confrontations will continue and whetherthey will ultimately harm or benefit humanistic education is anybody's guess. Even if they are harmful, the argument can always be made that it is better to be right and suffer than to remain silent. On the other hand, it can also be argued that the university's traditional status as a sanctuary--with the corollary provision of academic freedom--is jeopardized whenever the classroom becomes a forum for indoctrination, no matter how worthy the values being taught.

The only certainty is that the young teacher--particularly the humanities teacher--will be in the thick of the fight for the next few years. His decisions will determine the course the humanities take, the conditions under which he works, and finally the place of the humanities in American life. Since the issue here is nothing less than whether we will become a technocracy or remain a civilization, he had better make his decisions with his eyes open.

VERBAL COMMUNICATION

by James M. McCrimmon*

THE SCOPE OF THE SUBJECT

In its widest scope verbal communication is the symbolization of experience and is therefore the means by which man gives order and continuity to knowledge. In this sense, all college courses deal with communication, since one's mastery of a subject depends on being able to communicate in it.

But as the term is conventionally used in colleges, verbal communication refers to those activities within a curriculum that are concerned with improving the communication skills of students as part of their general education. In many foreign and some American colleges these skills are developed in a tutorial system or as part of the normal conduct of courses in humanities and in the social sciences. In most American colleges students are also required to take additional courses which have as their primary function the improvement of the student's reading, writing, and speaking abilities. These courses--usually called Freshman English and Beginning Speech--have no content other than the art of communication, though they may draw material from a wide spectrum of subjects in the sciences and humanities. It is with the work of these courses that this paper is principally concerned.

Although methods of dealing with reading vary, the majority practice is to assign reading selections--essays, articles, poems, stories, plays--to be read in private and discussed in class. The purpose of the discussion is to evaluate the readings as effective communications by whatever criteria are pertinent. Since many of the selections will raise questions of interpretation and judgment, the discussion may revolve around controvertial issues which may be further explored through speeches or papers. For example, a passage in Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" may put "Hell no, we won't go!" into a larger context and initiate a debate on the rights and obligations of individuals in modern society. Or a reading of Joseph Bronowski's essay, "The Reach of the Imagination," with its persuasive emphasis on the unity of scientific and poetic imagination, may provoke a written criticism of the fragmentation of learning imposed by the arbitrary classifications of college curriculums. The work on reading therefore tends to be integrated with written or oral composition and to provide contexts out of which student communications will emerge.

---

*Dr. McCrimmon is professor of English, Florida State University.

This kind of discussion draws on a complex of skills. It depends first on the accurate interpretation of the selection, a task that may require perception of the interrelations of purpose, structure, and style. It assumes the ability to evaluate the logical relation between premises and conclusions. It demands careful listening to follow the course of the discussion. And it requires skill in impromptu exposition and argument. If the discussion is successful, what started out as a reading exercise can become a concentrated communication experience.

In some programs this method of improving reading skills is supplemented by textbook exercises to increase speed and comprehension. It is generally agreed that by such exercises a motivated student can double or triple his reading rate for expository material without loss of comprehension. Other exercises are designed to improve ability to outline an essay or to evaluate the truth or pertinence of statements and make valid inferences from them. If individual students need remedial assistance, they may be referred to a reading clinic maintained as part of the student-counseling services.

During the fifties many colleges experimented with instruction in listening, but it is now generally believed that, except in untypical cases, students can listen effectively if they want to; indeed, in test situations their listening abilities are often impressive. The consensus seems to be that deficiencies in listening result from inadequate motivation and that this cause is not permanently affected by instruction in listening techniques. Better results seem to be obtained by improvement in the lectures themselves by either or both of two methods: by greater concern with the relevance of the lecture material to student needs, or by conscious attempts to encourage more student involvement by using what Marshall McLuhan calls the "cool" medium of discussion instead of the "hot" one of the conventional lecture.

The work on writing and speech will be discussed here as composition, on the assumption that composition of the message is the basic skill to be developed. Speech teachers, of course, must also be concerned with voice and delivery, but these will be ignored here in order to avoid the duplication that would result if speaking and writing were treated separately. For ease of reference, "author" will be used to designate both speaker and writer, and "audience" for both listener and reader.

In a sustained act of composition the author has to observe five requirements. First, he must be sensitive to the implications of the situation in which the communication takes place, since what he says or writes will be largely influenced by that situation. Second, he must know the kind of audience he is addressing so as to determine how best to communicate with it. Third, he must understand his own purpose--the effects he wishes to produce and the ways in which his choices of materials, organization, tone, and style promote or hinder these effects. Fourth, he must be sophisticated about the nature of language: the relation of words to things, the part played by context, connotations, theuse and abuse of figures of speech--in short, the ways language works and does not work. Finally, he must be aware of the interaction that constantly goes on between author and audience as each responds to the other. Some of these requirements will be more important in speech than in writing, but all of them are theoretically decisive in both types of communication.

This summary description of the requirements of effective composition is not presented here to intimidate a young teacher, but partly to show the scope of the subject and partly to help him see specific problems in perspective. For example, one of the practices that have impeded effective teaching of composition is the excessive emphasis on "correct usage." Problems of usage are legitimate concerns, since schools are obligated to help students speak and write in the standard dialect, but failure to treat these problems in proper perspective often encourages students to assume that the major criterion of effective communication is the absence of mechanical errors. This distortion has been compounded by an uncritical prejudice for the most formal usage on all occasions, without consideration of the situation, the audience, or the author's purpose.

TRENDS IN THE FIELD

Despite their diversity, communication courses have reflected certain broad changes in college education during the last 10 years. Most of these changes had their origins in three conditions: A rapidly expanding college population which resulted in more selective admission standards; a noticeable improvement in the preparation and motivation of incoming students, caused chiefly by competition to get into preferred colleges; and pressure inside and outside the colleges to improve the quality of instruction and to make it more relevant. Faced with these conditions, colleges generally have made a commitment to what is popularly described as "the pursuit of excellence."

Administratively, this commitment has been and is being met in several ways: by closer cooperation of college and high school faculties in federally supported projects to improve high school instruction in all subjects, by the elimination of remedial courses originally designed for inadequately prepared freshmen, by in-service training and supervision of graduate assistants teaching in large, multi-sectioned freshman courses, by honors programs for superior students, and by "enrichment"of established courses.

The enrichment of the communication courses has generally consisted of attempts to raise the academic respectability of these courses by introducing more demanding content. The most common example is a stronger emphasis on literature. Since teachers in freshman English courses have their undergraduate and graduate majors in literature and find that subject more congenial to teach than composition, it is natural for them to assume that a heavier concentration on literature will improve the quality of the reading, writing, and discussion in that course.

For example, a common major assignment in freshman English is "the research paper," a long paper developing the conclusion that a student has reached from independent reading. When well done, this assignment can be a valuable experience, since it requires the student to learn how to use the library, to read and evaluate a sizable unmber of works, to reach a conclusion and select pertinent material to support it, to organize and present that material in essay form, and to use accepted forms of bibliography and footnotes. But when students have an unrestricted choice of subjects, some of the papers may be trivial. If the papers are restricted to literary topics, the instructor feels better qualified to direct each study and evaluate the results and thus to ensure that the project has been worthwhile.

But despite obvious advantages, an emphasis on literature may have potential disadvantages, for if the communication is exclusively or even predominantly restricted to literary criticism, other valuable kinds of communication may be ignored, and a course originally designed to let students range through a variety of writing experiences may become another course in literature. An instructor who is alert to this possibility may guard against it, but where the emphasis on literature is strongest there is likely to be less opportunity for a student to explore non-literary subjects.

As a second means of enriching programs teachers have encouraged students to acquire a greater understanding of the resources of language. Such knowledge comes from the study of semantics and from grammar. Semantics is usually thought of as the study of the meanings of words, but it includes more than the kinds of meanings that are found in a dictionary. It is concerned with the relation between words and things, with the abstract nature of language, with the part context plays in determining meaning, with informative and affective uses of language, with metaphor--in short, with all the factors in our use and abuse of words.

The two major figures in the modern literature on semantics are I. A. Richards and Alfred Korzybski. Richards has had a significant influence on English teachers both as a semanticist and as a leader of the new criticism, and through his writings are generally too difficult for freshmen, part of what he has to say about meaning has filtered into the classroom. The work of Korzybski, as interpreted by his popularizers, especially S. I. Hayakawa, was largely responsible for a considerable enthusiasm for the study of semantics during the forties. That enthusiasm has about run its course, bu t the study of meaning remains a significant part of the study of language and is now attracting the attention of the linguists.

Another way of enriching theprogram is through a sophisticated study of grammar, usually called linguistics. Grammar has always been part of the composition course, although its chief use has been in the analysis and correction of errors. But in the last 20 years there have been two revolutions against traditional methods of describing English grammar. The first was lead by the "structural" grammarians, who rejected the confused definitions of the traditional parts of speech and adopted a description based on structural elements of form, word order, and intonation. Recently, structural analysis is being superseded by "transformational" grammar, a system which describes the language by revealing the rules by which complex sentences may be generated from basic or "kernel" sentences.

The effect of transformational grammar has been a change in emphasis from analyzing to synthesizing sentences, from identifying and explaining parts of sentences to constructing new sentences. This new grammar establishes a clearer relation between grammar and conposition than either of its predecessors. So far, it has delt largely with the syntax of the sentence, but as its scope widens, as it is rapidly doing, it may have something of value to offer in the study of style. Its chief disadvantage as an aid to composition at present is that the time required to learn the system is excessive for the contribution it makes. This disadvantage will be greatly reduced if transformational grammar becomes the established method in elementary and secondary schools.

The most recent discipline to enrich the communication program is a revival of rhetoric called the "new rhetorics." Historically, the foundation for all serious work in communication was classical rhetoric, best revealed in the writings of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. This rhetoric is one of the great traditions of western culture,but since the Renaissance its influence on the schools has steadily declined, and for a long time it has been judged inadequate to meet the complex needs of modern communication. During the last 40 years, however, the writings of I. A. Richards, Kenneth Burke, and a number of social scientists have cumulatively been building toward a modern rhetoric which combines the best of classical theory with discoveries in the social sciences. These writings are collectively called the "new rhetorics." Within the last 5 or 6 years they have begun to attract attention in the colleges.

The major impact of the new rhetorics on the teaching of composition is a renewed emphasis on invention. Traditionally, the art of rhetoric has been divided into three main stages--invention, arrangement, and style. Invention is the creative stage of composition, the state at which the speaker or writer is thinking out his approach to the subject and creating or discoering his materials; arrangement is the stage at which he organizes his materials into a structure; and style is the stage at which he develops that structure into effective statement.

Until recently the emphasis in the teaching of writing has been preponderantly on style, especially on those matters of style that deal with correct usage. Instructors have also paid considerable attention to organization, mostly to outlining and the structure of paragraphs, but have done almost nothing about invention. They have acted as though deciding the purpose and content of a communication is solely the student's responsibility. This is still the prevailing attitude, but now there is a growing awareness that arrangement and style are consequences of decisions made during the invention stage and that the place to put the emphasis is at the beginning of the composition process, not at the end.

In written composition, work in the invention stage is popularly called "prewriting." The prewriting covers that part of the composing that precedes the first draft. In this stage the writer is planning what he wants to do: he is defining his subject--that is, he is trying to discover his own personal view of the subject; he is analyzing the situation to see what it requires of him; he is trying to understand the needs and attitudes of his audience; and he is seeking to determine how the decisions he has made about subject, situation, and audience will affect the structure, tone, and style of his writing.

This is a brief and oversimplified description of a complex procedure, butthe contrast between the two preceding paragraphs will illustrate a major change in emphasis. Insofar as this change reflects a trend, it is a trend toward considering the act of composition as a consistent working out of the implications of decisions made during the author's analysis of his communication problem. The emphasis, in effect, has moved from rewriting to prewriting. Ideally the prewriting controls the writing; in practice the writer will still have to make new choices as he writes and rewrites, but the criteria for making these choices are known to him and will keep them harmonious.

TEACHING PROCEDURES

For two reasons composition is a difficult subject to teach. First, composition is an art, not a science, and it therefore has no subject matter content in the sense that history, mathematics, or grammar has content. As indicated earlier, each author is involved at every stage in a complex system of choices. The teacher cannot reduce these choices to any set of standard rules. Because he is always concerned with what is appropriate for this author addressing this audience on this subject in this situation, he cannot organize his work into a sequence of prepared lessons or make extensive use of last year's notes. He has to teach what an ever-changing situation demands of him.

Second, all judgments about writing and speaking made by both the teacher and the student are highly subjective. The student must draw his ideas from his own experience and develop these ideas in his own way. Except when he is making a factual report he must put himself into his work. He has thus a personal, often an emotional, commitment to what he has done. On the other hand, the teacher's evaluation of student work, except for mechanical matters, is also subjective. Because of this double subjectivity there is always the possibility of opposition between student and teacher. The student may feel that the teacher is trying to force his own preferences on the communication, and sometimes the feeling is justified. The teacher may feel that the student is obstinate, as indeed he may be. This potential conflict of interests seldom results in an impasse, but it does challenge the teacher to present necessary critcism in a way to getit accepted.

Obviously, what is required in this situation is a mutual confidence between teacher and student, and the responsibility for establishing this confidence rests primarily with the teacher. His day-to-day conduct in the classroom must make students feel that he respects them as people, that he cares about helping them to develop their potential, and that he is not trying to dominate them. If he can create that kind of rapport he can speak frankly about their work, and they will respect his judgments even though they may disagree with some of them.

Again, in this kind of situation, the preferred method of conducting the class is through discussion. Since the kind of knowledge the teacher is seeking for his students is a knowledge of composition as a process, he must bring them into that process, not just as authors but also as critics. He must get them to talk critically about the work produced in the class. The only practical way to do this is through a dialog which runs between teacher and student and among the students themselves.

This dialog will be successful only if students recognize it as an honest one. They will not respond, or will respond perfunctorily, if they suspect that the instructor is manipulating them into making choices which he has already predetermined. Faced with this lack of response, an inexperienced teacher may retreat into a monologue which makes discussion impossible. This does not imply that a teacher should never lecture in a composition class. There are occasions when the job requires him to give a sustained talk, but such a talk should be justified by obvious need; it should not be a substitute for discussion.

Critical dialogue is facilitated when the class itself is the audience to which student communications are addressed. This is usually the situation in speech classes, where the student speaker is facing his classmates and talking directly to them. It is usually not the situation when the communications are written. Then the work is prepared for and submitted to the instructor, who reads it in private and may or may not share it with the class. This practice of having the papers written for the instructor has several disadvantages: it unnecessarily sets up a polarity between instructor and students; it inhibits free student response to the writing, because the instructor has assumed a role which leaves the judgments to him; it encourages student writers to guess what the instructor likes, and so distorts their function as writers; and it reduces criticism of all work to one man's opinion.

Making the class the real audience for which every student writes creates better teaching opportunities. It has been said that throughout the composing process the author is making choices. When these choices are open to class evaluation by duplicating or projecting a paper or by having it read aloud, some student may challenge a choice. The class can then be asked to suggest alternatives, and these, in turn, can be evaluated. If there is a clear class preference for one choice, the author of the paper is likely to accept the revision. But if there is a marked division of opinion within the class, it probably indicates some crux at which the group needs direction or advice. If no other member can resolve this crux, the instructor may be appealed to, or he may volunteer an opinion. In either event his instruction comes in response to a recognized need, and there is all the difference in the world beteen this kind of instruction and judgments delivered ex cathedra.

Class discussion of a composition problem can also occur during the prewriting stage. Students can be asked to report orally on what they intend to do and how they intend to do it, and the resulting discussion may anticipate difficulties or make profitable suggestions. Indeed, students should be encouraged to talk over their plans for a paper or speech outside of the classroom and to consult classmates or the instructor on how particular problems might best be handled. This is what the instructor himself does when he writes an article or a speech: he passes the work around among selected colleagues for critical comment which he may use in revision. The only thing that stands in the way of such a practice is the fear that some students will take undue advantage of it. That may happen, but if it does it is a sign that there is an unresolve question of values that the class should consider.

In the final analysis, the question of preferred teaching methods has to be answered by the instructor's own prewriting of the course. If he has made careful decisions about what he wants to achieve, if he knows the kinds of challenges students are ready for and how they can best be motivated to meet these challenges, and if he is resolved to lead without dominating, he has in effect predetermined his teaching procedures. Experience will teach him that in the classroom things never quite go as they were planned; it will also teach him that sometimes departures from the script result in improved instruction.

Suggestions for Further Reading

The following selective list of books deals with various aspects of verbal communication. Since most of the items cited contain bibliographies of their own, this list may be used as a starting point for further investigation. In addition, the leading journals dealing with communication are excellent sources for articles--College English, College Composition and Communication, The Quarterly Journal of Speech, and the Harvard Educational Review.

Baugh, Albert C. A History of the English Language. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957. The standard history.

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960. A good college textbook on verbal communication.

Brooks, Cleanth and R. P. Warren. Modern Rhetoric, Second Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958. One of the major college textbooks on composition.

Chomsky, Noam. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M. I. T. Press, 1965. The "bible" of transformational grammar, but because of its difficulty, some readers will prefer to start with a simpler treatment. See Thomas below.

Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric For the Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965. The best application of classical rhetoric to college composition.

Corbin, Richard and others, eds. Language Programs For The Disadvantaged. Champaign, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1965. Report of an NCTE committee on the teaching of English to the disadvantaged. Although chiefly concerned with elementary and secondary schools, the work offers a helpful analysis of a problem which is becoming common in colleges.

Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press, 1958. A good example of the structural approach to linguistics.

Gorrell, Robert M. ed. Rhetoric: Theories for Application Champaign, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1967. An anthology of articles dealing with the new rhetorics. This volume supplements that of Steinmann below.

Guth, Hans P. *English Today and Tomorrow*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964. A comprehensive guide for teachers of English.

Hayakawa, S. I. *Language in Thought and Action*, Second Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964. A popularization of Alfred Korzybski's *Science and Sanity* and the most readable introduction to semantics.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963. An authoritative criticism of the freshman composition course.

Koestler, Arthur. *The Act of Creation.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964. Also available in paperback. A study of the conscious and unconscious processes in humor, scientific discovery, and art. A major contribution to the study of invention.

McCrimmon, James M. *Writing With a Purpose*, Fourth Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967. A composition textbook influenced by the new rhetorics. The first two chapters deal in detail with prewriting.

Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968. Presents a rationale for a language arts curriculum in elementary and secondary schools. Useful to the college teacher for its criticism of existing curricula.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning*, Eighth Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1946. Also available in paperback as a Harvest Book. One of the earliest and most influential works on semantics.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Also available in paperback edition. A series of lectures emphasizing the need for a new rhetoric which is primarily concerned with removing the misunderstandings caused by our uses of language.

__________. *How to Read a Page.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company 1942. Written in reply to a popular book on reading. Richards' thesis is that reading is a difficult art and the best way to practice it is to be aware of the "great" words which cause most of the trouble.

Saporta, Sol. Psycholinguistics: A Book of Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. An anthology showing the interdisciplinary nature of modern scholarship in language.

Steinmann, Martin Jr., ed. New Rhetorics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967. An anthology of articles on the new rhetorics.

Thomas, Owen. Transformational Grammar and the Teaching of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. A simplified account of transformational grammar.

Windes, Russell R., ed. The Bobbs-Merrill Series in Speech Communication. Indianapolis, Indiana: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1966. A series of twelve small paperback volumes, each of which deals with a separate phase of oral communication--for example, audience analysis, message preparation, ethics of speech communication, communication behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education. The Future Academic Community: Permanence and Change. Washington: ACE, 1968.

American Association for Higher Education. Decision Making in Higher Education (papers from Summer Conference, Dallas, 1968). Washington: AAHE, 1968.

Armour, Richard. "Young Instructor." Going Around in Academic Circles. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Association of American Colleges. Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College. Washington: American Council on Education, 1964.

Astin,, A. W., "Undergraduate Institutions and the Production of Scientists," Science, 141 (1963), 334-338.

Axelrod, Joseph. The Freedom to Learn: A Framework for Studying and Reforming the Curricular-Instructional Subsystem in American Colleges. Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969 (mimeographed).

_______________. "An Experimental College Model," Educational Record, Fall, 1967, p.336.

_______________and Donald N. Bigelow. "The Audiolingual Approach in College Language Teaching," in Resources for Language and Area Studies in the United States. Washington: American Council on Education, 1962.

_______________, Mervin B. Freedman, Winslow R. Hatch, Joseph Katz, and Nevitt Sanford. Search for Relevance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Bailey, Jackson H., "Non-Western Studies in the Small Liberal Arts College ...," Liberal Education, 47 (1961), 405-11.

Barnard, W. R., "Teaching Aids," Journal of Chemical Education, 45 (1968), 63, 136, 206, 341, 543, 617, 745.

Baugh, Albert C. A History of the English Language. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Bell, Daniel. The End of Ideology. New York: Free Press, 1960.

____________. Reforming of General Education. New York: Columbia University, 1966.

Bell, E.T. The Development of Mathematics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945.

Benacerraf, P., and E. Putnam. Philosophy of Mathematics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960.

Berlyne, D. E. Conflict, Arousal, and Curiosity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Bowles, Frank. The Refounding of the College Board, 1948-1963. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967.

Boyer, D. B. A History of Mathematics. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Bronowski, Jacob. Science and Human Values. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Brooks, Cleanth, and B. P. Warren. Modern Rhetoric. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.

Brown, Donald R. "Student Stress and Student Development," Memo to the Faculty, No. 26. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1968.

Brubacher, John S. Bases for Policy in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1965.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Cantor, Norman F., and Richard I. Schneider. How to Study History. New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1967.

Caplow, Theodore, and Reece J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Carmichael, Oliver C. Graduate Education: Critique and a Program. New York: Harper, 1961

Carpenter, P. History Teaching: The Era Approach. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Cass, James, and Max Birnbaum. Comparative Guide to American Colleges. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Chambers, M. M. The Colleges and the Courts 1962-1966. Danville,Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, 1965.

Cohen, Arthur A. *Humanistic Education and Western Civilization*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Cohen, Maurice, "Toward a Basic Undergraduate Course in World Civilization," *Liberal Education*, 51 (1965), 209-20.

Conant, Jas. B., *ed*. *Harvard Case Histories in Experimental Science*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Coons, Arthur G. *Crises in California Higher Education*. Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1968.

Corbett, Edward P. J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Corbin, Richard, and others, eds. *Language Programs For the Disadvantaged*. Champaign, Ill.: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Court, N. A. *Mathematics in Fun and in Earnest*, New York: Dial Press, 1958.

Cowles Guide to Graduate Schools. New York: Cowles Education Corporation, 1968.

Cox, Harvey, "Underground Churches, Underground Schools," *Commonweal*, LXXXIX (13 December 1968), 376-78.

Crane, Ronald S., "Questions and Answers in the Teaching of Literary Texts," *The Idea of the Humanities and Other Essays Critical and Historical*, 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967. II. 176-96.

Dennis, Lawrence, and Renate M. Jacob. *The Arts in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Del Olmo, Guillermo, Dwight Bolinger, and Victor E. Hanzeli, "Professional and Pragmatic Perspectives on the Audio-lingual Approach," *Foreign Language Annals*, II, 1 (October 1968), 19-50.

DeVane, William C., "The College of Liberal Arts," in Robert S. Morison, ed., *The Contemporary University: U.S.A.*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1966, p. 7.

The Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Spirit of Science. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1966.

The Efficiency of Freedom, Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1959.

Elton, G. R. The Practise of History. New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1967.

Ericksen, Stanford C., "An Experimental Study of Individual Differences in Scholastic Motives," Journal of Educational Psychology, (1940), 507-516.

____________________., "Education for Transfer of Learning in a Changing Environment," Journal of Dental Education, 31 (1967), 342-347.

____________________. "Simulation," Memo to the Faculty, No. 19. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1966.

Erikson, Erik H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.

Evolution of Mathematical Concepts. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968.

Fader, Daniel N., and Morton H. Schaevitz. Hooked on Books. New York: Berkley Medallion Books. 1966.

Featherstone, Joseph, "Experiments in Learning," The New Republic, CLIX (14 December 1968), 23-25.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb, The Impacts of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Finkelstein, Joseph, "Freshman History: the Neglected Course," Liberal Education, 46 (1960), 267-72.

Focte, Caleb, et al. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press, 1958.

Garrison, Roger H. Teaching in a Junior College. Washington: the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Geiger, Louis S., "Recruiting History Faculty--the Liberal Arts College," Liberal Education, 54 (1968), 294-99.

Gerber, John C., John H. Fisher, and Curt A. Zimansky, eds. The College Teaching of English. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965

Gleason, Ralph J., "Bob Dylan: Poet to a Generation," This World (San Francisco Chronicle magazine section), Aug. 18, 1968, p. 33.

Goode, Delmer M. Improving College and University Teaching. Corvallis, Oreg: Oregon State University. (Quarterly.)

Gorrell, Robert M., ed. Rhetoric: Theories for Application. Champaign, Ill.: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

Greenberg, Daniel S. The Politics of Pure Science. New York: The New American Library, 1967.

Gustavson, Carl G., A Preface to History. New York: McGraw, 1955.

Guth, Hans P. English Today and Tomorrow. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Haley, B.F., "The Content of the Introductory Course," American Economic Review Proc., 52 (May 1962), 474-482.

Hayakawa, S. I. Language in Thought and Action. 2nd ed., New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Heist, Paul. The Creative College Student: An Unmet Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Heller, Robert L., ed. Geology and Earth Sciences Sourcebook. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Hodgkinson, Harold, "Governance and Factions-Who Decides Who Decides?" Research Reporter (CRDHE, Berkeley), vol. 3, no. 1, 1968.

________________, "Students and an Intellectual Community," Educational Record, Fall, 1962.

Holland, J. L., "Determinants of College Choice," College and University, 34 (1959), 11-28.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.

Hughes, H. Stuart. History as Art and Science. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

________________, "Science, A Component of Liberal Education," Journal of Chemical Education, 44 (1967) 261.

Hutchinson, Eric, "Fashion in Science and in the Teaching of Science," Journal of Chemical Education, 45 (1968) 600.

Hutton, James. Theory of the Earth. Vol. 2, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1795.

The Importance of Teaching: A Memorandum to the New College Teacher. Commission on Undergraduate Education, C. Easton Rothwell, chairman. New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation (1968).

Ingraham, Mark H. The Outer Fringe. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

________________, and Francis P. King. The Mirror of Brass. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

James, William. Principles of Psychology, 1890.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1968.

Joughin, Louis, ed. Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Judson, Sheldon, "Geomorphology and Geology", Transactions, New York Academy of Sciences, Ser. II, 20 (1958) 305-315.

Kai-yu, Hsu. Twentieth-Century Chinese Poetry, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1963.

Katz, Joseph. The Student Activists: Rights, Needs, and Powers of Undergraduates. New Dimensions in Higher Education series. Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

Keeney, Barneby C., "The Dilemmas of Relevance and Commitment," Liberal Education, 52 (1966), 27-33.

Keyser, C. J. The Human Worth of Rigorous Thinking. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Kline, M. Mathematics in Western Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Knopf. Adolf, "The Geologic Records of Time," Time and its Mysteries, Ser. 3, (1949) 33-59.

Knopf, K. A., and J. H. Stauss, eds. The Teaching of Elementary Economics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Koestler, Arthur. The Act of Creation. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1964.

Kott, Jan, "King Lear as Endgame," in Shakespeare, Our Contemporary, Garden City, New York.: Doubleday.

Kubie, Lawrence. Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process. Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Press, 1958.

Lee, Calvin B.T. Improving College Teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Leuba, C., "Using Groups in Independent Study," Antioch College Reports, No. 5 (1963).

Lumsden, Keith G. New Developments in the Teaching of Economics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1967.

MacLeod, Robert B, "The Teaching of Psychology and the Psychology We Teach," American Psychologist, 20 (1965) 344-352.

McCrimmon, James M. Writing With a Purpose. (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

McKeachie, Wilbert J., "The Discussion Group," Memo to the Faculty, No. 14. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1965.

___________________, "Motivation, Teaching Methods, and College Learning," in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1961, ed. M. R. Jones. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1962.

________________, "New Developments in Teaching," Report for Higher Education Literature Search Project. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1966.

________________. Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. (5th ed.) Ann Arbor, George Wahr Publishing Co., 1965.

McKee, John M., "The Draper Experiment: A Programmed Learning Project," in Trends in Programmed Instruction, eds. Gabriel D. Ofiesh and Wesley C. Meierhenry. Washington: Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, 1964.

Mann, Richard, "Project OUTREACH: An Innovation in Teaching Introductory Psychology," Development and Experiment in College Teaching, 2 (1966), 14.

Means, Richard L., "Research vs. Teaching: Is There a Genuine Conflict?" Liberal Education, 54 (1968), 238-44.

Minter, John W. The Individual and the System. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1967.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1968.

Moise, E. E., "Activity and Motivation in Mathematics," American Mathematical Monthly, 72 (1965) 407-412.

Nowlis, Vincent, Kenneth E. Clark, and Miriam Rock. The Graduate Student as Teacher. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

O'Connor, Patricia, "Motivation To Learn," Memo to the Faculty, No. 7. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1964.

Ogden, D. K., and I. A. Richards. The Meaning of Meaning. (8th ed.) New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1946.

Ore, O., "Mathematics for Students of the Humanities," American Mathematical Monthly, 51 (1944) 453-458.

Paige, Glen D., "The Professor and Politics," AAUP Bulletin, 52 (1966), 52-56.

Palmer, J. H. The Rise of English Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 107.

Parker, William Riley, "The Future of the 'Modern Humanities,'" Addresse at the Jubilee Congress of MHRA, Cambridge University, August 26-30, 1968, in Newsletter, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University English Department. III (2 December 1968), 69-81. (mimeographed)

__________________, "Where Do English Departments Come From?" *College English*, XXVIII (February 1967), 339-51.

Perkins, Dexter, "We Shall Gladly Teach," *American Historical Review*, 62 (1956-57), 291-309.

Physical Science for Nonscience Students, L. G. Bassett, director, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.

Platt, John. *The Excitement of Science*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Polya, C. *Mathematical Discovery*. 2 vols. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Postlethwait, S. N., Harvey D. Telinde, and David G. Husband. *Introduction to Plant Science*. Mineapolis, Minn.: Burgess Publishing Co. 1966.

"Recent Trends in Undergraduate Chemistry Curricula," *Journal of Chemical Education*, 41 (1964), 126-147.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936.

______________. *How To Read a Page*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 1942.

Richardson, M., "Mathematics and Intellectual Honesty," *American Mathematical Monthly*, 59 (1952) 73-78.

Ridgeway, James. *The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis*. New York: Random House, 1968.

Rogers, Carl, "The Facillitation of Significant Learning," *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints*, ed. L. Siegel. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.

"The Role of Intuition," *Science* 156 (1967) 605-610.

Roucek, Joseph S., ed. *The Teaching of History*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1967.

Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

__________, ed. The American College. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Saporta, Sol. Psycholinguistics: A Book of Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Schwab, Joseph J. The College Curriculum and Student Protest. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Shafer, Boyd C., "The Study of History in the United States," AAUP Bulletin, 50 (1964), 232-40.

__________, et al. Historical Study in the West..., New York: 1968.

Shepard, Paul, and Daniel McKinley. The Subversive Science. Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1968.

Shugrue, Michael F. English in a Decade of Change. New York: Pegasas, 1968.

Singletary, Otis. Freedom and Order on the Campus. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

__________ and Jane P. Newman, ed., American Universities and Colleges. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Skinner, B. F., "The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching," Harvard Education Review, 24 (1954), 86-97.

__________. The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. "Stress and Campus Response," Current Issues in Higher Education, 1968., American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

__________, "New Perspectives in Teaching the Disciplines," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1962.

Smith, Page. The Historian and History. New York: 1964.

Somit, Albert, and Joseph Tanenhaus. American Political Science. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

Squire, James R., "The Running Water and the Standing Stone," PMLA, June 1968, 523-29.

Stein, Maurice, Arthur J. Vidich, and David Manning White, eds. Identity and Anxiety. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.

Steinmann, Martin, Jr., ed. New Rhetorics. New York: Charles Scribner's , 1967.

Stent, Gunther S., "That Was the Molecular Biology That Was," Science, 160 ((1968) 390-395.

"Symposium on Chemistry for Non-Science Majors," Journal of Chemical Education, 45 (1968) 550, 46 (1968), 64, 66, 69.

Taylor, Horace, ed., "The Teaching of Undergraduate Economics," Report of the Committee on the Undergraduate Teaching of Economics and the Training of Economists, American Economic Review, Supplement, 40, 5 (December 1950).

Thistlethwaite, D. L. College Press and Changes in Study Plans of Talented Students. Evanston, Ill.: National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 1960.

Thomas, Owen. Transformational Grammar and the Teaching of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Waismann, F. W. Introduction to Mathematical Thinking. Translated by T J. Benac. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1951.

Ward, Paul L. A Style of History for Beginners. Washington: American Historical Association, 1967.

Weber, Arnold, et al. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

Weinberg, Alvin M., "The Two Faces of Science," Journal of Chemical Education, 45 (1968) 74.

Whitehead, Alfred North. The Aims of Education. New York: Mentor Books, 1949.

Wilder, R. L., "The Cultural Basis of Mathematics," in Proceedings of the International Congress, 1 (1950) 258-271.

Windes, Russell R., ed. The Bobbs-Merrill Series in Speech Communication. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966.

Wolfle, Dael, editorial in Science 161, September 20, 1968.

____________ et al. Improving Undergraduate Instruction in Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Woodburn, John H., and Ellsworth S. Obourn. Teaching in the Pursuit of Science. New York: MacMillan Co., 1965.

Young, J. A., "What Should Students do in the Laboratory?" Journal of Chemical Education, 45 (1968), 789.

Zinn, Karl L., "Testing Academic Achievement," Memo to the Faculty, No. 5. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1964.

Addendum

Brown, David G. The Mobile Professors. Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.

Ericksen, Stanford C., "The Lecture," Memo to the Faculty, No. 30. Ann Arbor: Center for Research and Learning, 1968.

Handbook for Chemistry Assistants. Easton, Pa.: Chemical Education Publishing Co., 1967.

Milholland, John, "The Assignment of Grades," Memo to the Faculty, No. 4 Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 1964.

Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.